3/6

G. Montagu Benton.

C. J. Bromwich
6th Oct 1882
A Birthday gift from
M.H.

THE

# BAMPTON LECTURES

FOR M.DCCC.LXXI.

# DISSENT,

IN ITS

*RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

## EIGHT LECTURES,

PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

IN THE YEAR

1871,

ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE LATE REV. JOHN BAMPTON, M.A.

CANON OF SALISBURY:

BY

GEORGE HERBERT CURTEIS, M.A.

*Late Fellow and Sub-Rector of Exeter College;*
*Principal of the Lichfield Theological College, and Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral;*
*Rector of Turweston, Bucks.*

FIFTH EDITION.

London

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1882

[*All rights reserved*]

OXFORD:
BY E. PICKARD HALL AND J. H. STACY,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

# EXTRACT

## FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT

OF THE LATE

## REV. JOHN BAMPTON,

CANON OF SALISBURY.

——"I give and bequeath my Lands and Estates to the "Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Oxford "for ever, to have and to hold all and singular the said Lands "or Estates upon trust, and to the intents and purposes herein-"after mentioned; that is to say, I will and appoint that the "Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford for the time "being shall take and receive all the rents, issues, and profits "thereof, and (after all taxes, reparations, and necessary deduc-"tions made) that he pay all the remainder to the endowment "of eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, to be established for ever "in the said University, and to be performed in the manner "following:

"I direct and appoint, that, upon the first Tuesday in Easter "Term, a Lecturer be yearly chosen by the Heads of Colleges "only, and by no others, in the room adjoining to the Printing-"House, between the hours of ten in the morning and two in "the afternoon, to preach eight Divinity Lecture Sermons, the "year following, at St. Mary's in Oxford, between the com-"mencement of the last month in Lent Term, and the end of "the third week in Act Term.

"Also I direct and appoint, that the eight Divinity Lecture

2067438

"Sermons shall be preached upon either of the following Sub-
"jects—to confirm and establish the Christian Faith, and to
"confute all heretics and schismatics—upon the divine autho-
"rity of the holy Scriptures—upon the authority of the writings
"of the primitive Fathers, as to the faith and practice of the
"primitive Church—upon the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour
"Jesus Christ—upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost—upon
"the Articles of the Christian Faith, as comprehended in the
"Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

"Also I direct, that thirty copies of the eight Divinity Lec-
"ture Sermons shall be always printed, within two months after
"they are preached; and one copy shall be given to the Chan-
"cellor of the University, and one copy to the Head of every
"College, and one copy to the Mayor of the city of Oxford,
"and one copy to be put into the Bodleian Library; and the
"expenses of printing them shall be paid out of the revenue of
"the Land or Estates given for establishing the Divinity Lecture
"Sermons; and the preacher shall not be paid, nor be entitled
"to the revenue, before they are printed.

"Also I direct and appoint, that no person shall be qualified
"to preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons, unless he hath taken
"the degree of Master of Arts at least, in one of the two Uni-
"versities of Oxford or Cambridge; and that the same person
"shall never preach the Divinity Lecture Sermons twice."

TO

The Rector and Fellows of Exeter College,

IN GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT

OF MUCH PERSONAL KINDNESS AND HOSPITALITY,

AND ALSO

OF INVALUABLE AID DERIVED FROM THE

FREE USE OF THEIR LIBRARY,

I DESIRE

TO DEDICATE THESE PAGES.

# PREFACE.

'Benevolentia etiam gladium iracundiæ extorquere consuevit. Benevolentia facit, ut amici vulnera utilia magis quàm voluntaria inimici oscula sint. Benevolentia facit, ut unus fiat ex pluribus . . Advertimus etiam, correptiones in amicitiâ gratas esse, — quæ aculeos habent, dolorem non habent.' (St. Ambrose, *de Officiis Ministrorum*, lib. i. cap. 34.)

THE purpose of Canon Bampton in founding this Lectureship seems to have been twofold. He first required that the Lectures should be delivered orally before the University: and next, he stipulated that they should be given, in a printed form, to the public. The double obligation thus imposed upon his Lecturers is one which is by no means easy of fulfilment. The celebrated saying of Charles Fox at once occurs to one's memory; that if a speech be orally effective, it cannot possibly be effective in print,—and *vice versâ*.

The only way therefore in which a Bampton Lecturer can hope to fulfil the intentions of the Founder, and to acquit himself loyally of the important trust committed to him by the electors, is (I think) after oral delivery of the Lectures at Oxford, to spare no pains in endeavouring to make of them a volume useful and interesting to persons of average intellectual culture, not only at the University, but elsewhere. And this can best be done, by slight expansions or abridgements of the spoken text, and by appending footnotes,

appendices, and other aids towards facility and completeness of apprehension.

This task I have honestly laboured to fulfil. And if, in fulfilling it, I have trespassed too much upon the patience of the University,—which (in ordinary cases) may fairly expect a diligent and speedy compliance with the conditions laid down by the Founder,—I venture to plead, in my defence, a simultaneous occupation of very unusual urgency and weight. The sole charge of an important Theological College, numbering from thirty to forty students, leaves a smaller margin of spare time than were desirable. But besides deficiency of time, I am too painfully aware of other deficiencies. And therefore I do not hope to have escaped some unintentional errors and mis-statements. Indeed, the subjects here passed in review are so numerous and varied, and are so historically intricate, that an apology seems rather needed for venturing on such a line of inquiry at all, than for attaining a very imperfect degree of success in following it out.

The subject, however, seemed demanded by the necessities of the Church of England at the present moment. And to strengthen her position in this country, to point out the true meaning of her connexion with the State, and (if possible) to conciliate by explanations those who are conscientiously—but, I think, under endless misapprehensions—endeavouring to subvert her influence and to destroy her vantage-ground for doing good, such a task appeared to me a privilege of the very highest order, and an opportunity to be (at all hazards) accepted. For, as Gregory Nazianzen said of Constantinople, 1500 years ago, so an English Churchman may with still greater reason say of his own country at the present day: Εἰ γὰρ τὸ πόλιν

*τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀφθαλμὸν, γῆς καὶ θαλάττης κράτιστον, ἑώας τε καὶ ἑσπερίου λήξεως οἷον σύνδεσμον, . . εἰ τὸ ταύτην στηρίξαι τε καὶ σθενῶσαι τοῖς ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις, τῶν οὐ μεγάλων, —σχολῇ γ' ἂν ἄλλο τὶ φανείη μέγα καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξιον.* (*Orat.* 32: tom. i. p. 517, ed. 1690.)

Indeed, the growth, culmination, and present decline of Puritanism in this country forms of itself a highly interesting subject of historical study. For 300 years this highly unimaginative form of religious character has predominated in England. The discoveries of the fifteenth century had set every mind thinking, that could think at all. And the awakened intellect was not to be diverted from its new and delightful path, by any Papal Indices of prohibited books, or prohibited thoughts. Symbols, legends, images, and all similar 'books for the unlearned,' might therefore be dispensed with for a time. Had not learning revived? And was there not in the air an enthusiasm for the *literæ humaniores*,—i. e. for Classics, History, and the science of 'Humanity' as distinguished from 'Divinity,'—such as may be illustrated, but has certainly not been rivalled, by our modern enthusiasm for 'Physical Science'? And so even Art, with her untold treasures of imaginative representation, was suddenly cast aside, and held of little account. Smitten, as if by a stroke of palsy, the life that seemed ever at work in developing her beautiful creations abruptly stood still. The window-sills of 'Becket's Crown' at Canterbury Cathedral were laid; but their lintels were never completed. In a word, the bare prosaic Intellect had awoke from its long slumber; and would, for a time, suffer no rival near it.

It is in this way that the sudden, and otherwise unaccountable, upgrowth of Puritanism in the sixteenth century can best be accounted for. It is not that the germs

of Puritanism have not existed in every age. We can see them even in the Montanism, the Novatianism, and the Donatism, of the ante-Nicene epoch. And probably the Dissenting historians are not far wrong, who discover a stunted and unkindly growth of opinions analogous to their own, in the Paulicians, Manichees, Albigenses, Hussites, and Lollards. These form (as it were) a *catena* to connect the earlier ultra-spiritual conceptions of Christianity with their later and fuller developments, amid the more congenial atmosphere and favourable circumstances of the last 300 years.

But that this long reign of Prose is now drawing to an end, no observant person can well entertain a doubt. And if it be drawing to an end, it is equally certain that Puritanism (at least in its present forms) is also drawing to an end. Indeed, every indication points the same way. The very restlessness and spasmodic energy which now pervades the whole Puritan camp, and which has succeeded in drawing over to its side—marvellous to relate—for a final struggle against the Church of England, those very Denominations (the Quakers, the Unitarians, and the Wesleyans) whose first-principles are in the most direct and positive contradiction of its own first-principles,—this too arises from the same cause; viz. a conviction that the time for action against the Church is drawing to a close, and that the assault must be made now, or not be made at all.

Whatever the result may be, however of the approaching conflict, one thing is absolutely certain,—that the victory will not *remain* with Puritanism; nor with any Denomination of which Puritanism forms the life and the essential doctrine. Putting aside the merely negative protests against a supposed over-externalism in

the Church, its positive tenets are simply these two: (1) the absolute supremacy of the mere letter of *Scripture* over the conscience and reason of mankind: (2) the doctrine of *Election*,—by which is involved the conception of God as a Being, whose character is so entirely incommensurate with our own, that He can bring into existence, and even seem to welcome within the arms of His mercy, millions of human beings, whom He has all along predestined, without any possibility of escape, to a never-ending eternity of excruciating torments. That either of these two conceptions will form any part of the Religion of the future, it is quite impossible to believe. Would that it were equally impossible to believe, that the fanatical Lama-ism[1] of modern Rome, and the sceptical materialism of modern Paris, will share the future between them, and draw asunder into two great hostile camps the slaves of mere Sentiment and the slaves of undisciplined and im-moral Reason.

Between these two violent and enormous extremes, there is only one power, so far as we can see at present, which possesses the smallest chance of maintaining the world in equilibrium; and which offers points of transition and reconciliation to both sides alike.

---

[1] That extraordinary parallelism between the ceremonies, the history, and even (in some respects) the doctrines of Budhism and Romanism, which has been the *despair* of some Romanists, (F. Schlegel ascribed it to demoniacal agency,) and the *hope* of others, (Père Huc longed to exhibit the rival attractions of 'the pompous festivals of Catholicism:' *Travels*, ii. 194,) has now, at length, received its completion by the act of the late Vatican Council.—'La suprématie du Grand Lama ne consista guère pendant longtemps qu'en un privilège de préséance. Il n'était encore que le premier parmi les égaux. Mais . . . le pouvoir spirituel aspire à la domination suprème . . . "Quand le Lama enseigne et consacre, il a un siège plus élevé, que celui de l'Empereur" . . . La forme monarchique se fortifia dans l'Église buddhique, et le clergé se soumit en général à la juridiction suprème d'un Grand Lama.' (*Revue Germanique*, vol. xii. p. 450.)

And that power is one which is growing perceptibly before our eyes, which every day is taking better shape, coming to a clearer consciousness of its own latent forces and of the vast issues committed to its loyalty and courage. It is (to use Dean Milman's phrase) THE CHURCH OF THE TEUTONIC RACE. In Europe, in America, in Africa, in Asia, in Australia, that Race has now established its supremacy. And what outward shape and organization its Church—i. e. its embodiment of religious ideas—shall take, is just at this juncture one of the most momentous questions of the day.

It is momentous for a great many reasons. But among the rest, for this reason: that the two other immediately important races in the world,—the Latin, and the Slavonian races,—have already each of them a fixed type of Episcopal Church-organization. And unless therefore our own branch of the great human family is prepared to forego all hope of eventual combination and reunion with these other branches,—is prepared, that is, to fail on the grand scale,—this generation of Englishmen, Americans, and Germans must take care that they lay out their ecclesiastical plans accordingly; and that they spoil not a magnificent future, by reckless and unintelligent confusions now.

Looking around then, what schemes are at the present moment presented to our choice, whereby the effort shall be made to organize Teutonic Christendom? Two only are in view: and they are these, (1) the scheme of 'the Evangelical Alliance:' (2) the scheme of 'the Old-Catholic Church.' The first scheme has certain advantages. It proposes to leave all Denominations free to exist and multiply to any conceivable extent. It offers a liberty of ecclesiastical action theoretically complete,—however practically self-destructive. And it presents,

in the great variety and eager competition of its various communions, the best possible guarantee against the return of that, which, however—outside of Romanism—is a mere chimæra, that never can take real shape again, viz. hierarchical tyranny, priestcraft, the relegation of all the powers and functions of the Christian brotherhood into the hands of an official clergy.

But, on the other hand, its perils and disadvantages infinitely outweigh all that can be said in its favour. It begins by despairing of agreement and unity, even in matters which its own axioms confess to be matters of indifference and of a purely secondary interest. By this fatal concession, that men no longer ought even to *try* and combine in one broad polity, it gives the reins over to self-will. It leaves the spirit of secession and of (what St. Paul calls) *διχο-στασία* absolutely without rebuke. And so encouraging every one to 'stand upon his rights,' instead of 'bending to his duties,' it endeavours to form a confederation of peace and harmony with unlimited interior rights of 'private war:' while, by its own limiting epithet of 'Evangelical,' it at once opens a question which no man can close,—what *is* it precisely to be 'Evangelical'? Who are thereby excluded? and by what authority?

These objections seem of themselves conclusive against the 'Evangelical Alliance' scheme. But they are strengthened a hundred fold by the consideration, that hereby would be sanctioned and consecrated, as if in full accordance with the mind of Christ, a scheme for the continuance and extension of His kingdom, involving such waste of power, such mutual obstruction, such a reticulated and mutually-contradictory aspect 'toward them that are without,'—as to render Christendom (far more than it is at present) a scandal and an object

of ridicule to the Heathen. It would make Missionary success in future absolutely hopeless; and all such conception of 'the Church and Family of Jesus Christ' as might enkindle men's imagination and engage their love, once and for ever out of the question.

And again, what can be said of a scheme, which proposes to break up, in front of the deep and serried phalanx of Rome, the whole opposing army into a mere cloud of skirmishers; to abandon interior discipline and subordination, just at the moment when the enemy has concentrated all his powers in one man's hand; to create a multitude of independent and infinitesimal commands, —with endless chances of misunderstandings, of cross purposes, of jealousies, bickerings, and loss of all 'solidarity,'—precisely at the hour when the whole vast Roman communion has surrendered itself, '*perinde ac cadaver*,' to the guidance of the General of the Jesuits; and has become travestied from a Church into a military 'company,' who march (it almost seems as if they cared not whither) at the word of Papal command. This were indeed to throw away victory out of our hand, and to abandon those very 'spiritual weapons of our warfare'—obedience, self-control, and unanimity—by which alone the strongholds of darkness can be overcome.

Happily, however, another alternative presents itself, from which almost all these fatal conditions of failure are absent; and that is, the Old-Catholic system of the Church. Here the watchword is not 'independence,' but 'unity.' Here each man and each congregation are called upon to sacrifice some portion of their private liberty, for the common benefit. The one normal type, both of organization and of ritual, is loyally maintained; but, at the same time, free play is allowed for local

preferences and national characteristics. Power, energy, and momentum are engendered—by clerical synods, and by mixed congresses, conventions, and conferences —among the lower orders of the Christian 'polity;' and edge, efficiency, and concentration are supplied by a graduated hierarchy, of which the uppermost ranks (archbishops and patriarchs) form centres and guarantees of unity, but are not invested with any considerable power; while the lower (bishops, rectors, &c.) are entrusted with practical and executive authority. According to this theory, as the Bishop of Rome is the Patriarch of the Latin Church (De Marca, *de Concord.* i. 2. 7), and the Bishop of Constantinople is the Patriarch of the Eastern Church, so the Archbishop of Canterbury is the Patriarch of (at least) the English-speaking Churches,—if he may not fairly claim the Presidency of the whole Teutonic Church, which owes its foundation mainly to English missions.

And if it be objected that this description idealizes, rather than depicts; the answer is, that in all such cases the highest and truest truth is not arrived at by mere statistics. There are always too many near-sighted people in the world, who 'cannot see the wood for the trees.' And as no one could love, or feel any enthusiasm for, or could even grasp as a conception, an 'Evangelical Alliance' presented from the side of its discordances, its mistakes in detail, the weaknesses and platitudes of its orators and defenders,—so in presenting the counter-portraiture of the 'Old-Catholic Church,' it is essential not to allow its beauty and effectiveness to be frittered away in detail, nor to claim men's admiration for a mere rough-hewn block of marble without describing the latent statue which at present (it may be) the sculptor's chisel has only half revealed.

Without therefore for a moment denying, or wishing to conceal, the many great imperfections and shortcomings of that presentation of the 'Old-Catholic' system, which now exists in the National Church of England; and still less desiring to disparage or obscure in any way whatever the advantages that belong to certain Dissenting schemes and the eminent virtues and talents that adorn many who at the present day support these schemes; I have endeavoured in the following Lectures simply to accomplish three things:—

*First*, I have aimed to show those (and they are neither few nor unworthy of attention) who are in despair at the present divided aspect of Christendom, that from the Apostles' time downwards there has never been an age of the Church without similar internal conflicts: that by certain well-tried methods and on certain well-known principles, these dissensions may be successfully kept within bounds, and made to minister to the life and movement of the whole polity: but that, ill-managed and suffered to run beyond the just limits of reason and good sense, they are always liable to become a wasting fever instead of a healthy warmth, a conflagration instead of a means of motion, and may even reach at last the absurdity of nullifying, by mutual jealousy and friction, the very purposes for which the Christian society was instituted.

*Secondly*, I have laboured to present, as far as my knowledge would allow, materials by which my fellow-Churchmen might be aided in forming an intelligent and candid judgment as to what precisely these Dissenting denominations, of which we hear almost to satiety, really are; what it is they do, and what they claim to teach; and why it is that,—with an acrimony so absolutely unaccountable to us, who know what she really is,—they

are now combining to bring the Church of England, if possible, to the ground.

*Thirdly*, my hope is—if I should have the good fortune to find any readers among Nonconformists themselves—to be permitted to point out some few indications, such as may at least awaken farther inquiry, of the wonderful and every way deplorable misapprehensions, which have clothed the Church of England to their eyes in colours absolutely foreign to her true character; have ascribed to her doctrines absolutely contrary to her meaning; and have interpreted her customs in a way repellent to the Christian common-sense of her own people. I do not disguise from myself, or from others, that these misapprehensions have arisen in great measure from the ineffective, and sometimes distorted, presentation of these things given by her own clergy; nor do I acquit her bishops and leading men in times past, and especially amid the confusions which inevitably followed upon the Reformation in the sixteenth century, of acting occasionally a most unworthy part and preparing the way for the present—contemptible, if it were not also treasonable—internecine war. But it is surely high time that these things were condoned. It is surely high time that religious men, and men who aim at truth, should take some pains, should welcome some self-denial, should be prepared (on both sides) to make some concessions and some acknowledgments of error,—in the interests, not of their own, but of their Master's cause.

For that cause is nothing less than the cause of Veracity, and Justice, and Charity, and Peace upon Earth. And it is threatened, now-a-days, by an imposing and accumulating force of all the Antichristian powers of ignorance, superstition, audacious intellectual pride, and an equally audacious intellectual despair,—a despair,

which would fain put out the eyes of men and cripple their limbs, lest they should undergo the dangers incident to walking alone, and should take upon them to dispense with artificial assistance.

Earnestly trusting that,—in spite (no doubt) of many unintentional mistakes which I have lacked the means of correcting, and of many slips and omissions and obscurities of which I am too painfully conscious,—these Lectures may be kindly judged by those to whom they were originally addressed, and taken as at least an honest attempt at 'explanation' by others into whose hands they may come,—I will borrow, in conclusion, the words of one of our most eloquent and lucid writers in quite another branch of study: 'I speak with more than the sincerity of an advocate, when I express my belief that the case against us has entirely broken down. The cry for Reform which has been raised, is needless; inasmuch as we have long been reforming from within. . . And the critical examination of the grounds upon which these very grave charges . . have been brought against us, rather shows that we have exercised a wise discrimination in declining, for the present, to meddle with our Foundations [2].'

[2] Prof. Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, &c. (Geological Reform), p. 279.

# PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

DURING the eight or nine months which have elapsed since the first edition of these Lectures issued from the press, a great number of Journals and Reviews have honoured the work with their notice. All these criticisms, whether favourable or unfavourable, have received the best attention that I could give them. And I feel bound to acknowledge the courtesy and candour with which, for the most part, my views and statements have been canvassed. Such courtesies form the sole gleam of light which irradiates the dark and dreary horizon of interminable theological dispute. For how can disputes ever terminate so long as prejudice holds people apart from each other, and causes (it would seem) the very *meaning of words* to become obscured and misunderstood? I do not doubt that some words, which are used by Dissenters in a way perfectly intelligible to themselves — such as 'church,' 'spiritual,' 'equality,' 'public-money,' and a great many more,— are often much misunderstood by Churchmen. But I am sure that a great many more words, as they are commonly used by Churchmen, are totally misunderstood by Dissenters[1]. Nay, when men are once separated and partitioned off from each other into sects and *coteries*, the very tones and cadences in which a sentence is meant to run are often entirely mistaken by the reader,—a phenomenon which has probably occurred to most people, in corresponding with friends whom

[1] Cf. p. 233, note 42, on 'Baptismal Regeneration'; and p. 236, note 45.

time, distance, or circumstances have (temporarily perhaps) estranged.

Thus, more than one critic of these Lectures has imagined that, by calling the last three centuries an 'age of prose,' I intended in some way to cast a slur upon Nonconformists[2]. Nothing, however, was farther from my thoughts. I have distinctly included Churchmen in the allegation: and I think a very little candid attention would shew, both that the allegation was true, and also that it was general in its sweep[3]. Meanwhile, it is a curious but (it seems) a frequent answer to make to this supposed charge, that 'it demands far more imagination to worship God in a Quakers' meeting-house than in a Roman Catholic cathedral[4].' But this is precisely what a Churchman says. The Quakers' Meeting gives one's imagination no aid at all.

Again, it is rather angrily demanded, in a criticism of the following passage: 'want of instruction as to the Church's meaning has arrayed people in hostility against her: there is not, it would seem, to this hour, any intelligent—that is to say any *real*—aversion either to her doctrines or her system:' who then 'are the "instructors" that have failed?' and 'is it really so that more than half[5] the Church-going people of England are not only "unintelligent," but false in their avowals of *real* aversion[6]?' Can it be necessary to answer these questions? The 'instructors' that have failed are our own clergy, through their grievous sin, neglect and ignorance,—as I had, I thought, sufficiently confessed throughout these pages. And, surely, if an 'aversion' is occasioned by a misunderstanding of any object,—as when you mistake your dearest friend for a robber,—there is no *real* aversion; but the avowal of it is not therefore 'false' or insincere.

---

[2] E.g. *The Congregationalist*, Sept. 1872, p. 560; *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 32.

[3] Cf. pp. xi, 269, 290, 404.

[4] *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 33; cf. *Theological Review*, Oct. 1872, p. 499.

[5] On this expression, see infra, p. 112, note 61.

[6] *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 51.

Once more, it has been vehemently objected—though how this can be possible I am at a loss to comprehend—that I 'affirm that the attitude and language of the Church *throughout its history* have presented the aspect of a friend sincerely and anxiously desirous to be reconciled[7].' My words were these: 'Thanks be to God, that the Church of England presents *at this moment*,—as she has repeatedly done during the long course of her history—the aspect of a friend . . . The attitude of our Church to most of the denominations is *now* distinctly conciliatory[8].' And in many a preceding page I had endeavoured—some people have thought with an excessive candour—to depict the darker shades of the Church's portrait, to confess that she was 'brought by slow degrees at last to see that force and persecution were the weapons of Antichrist[9],' to own that 'the leaders of the Church at that time thrust out the Wesleyans[10],' to acknowledge that 'the great Churchmen of former days lent themselves far too readily to the merely political purposes of the State[11],' and to profess that 'of the persecutions which the Quakers underwent, we (to speak for ourselves) are heartily sorry and repentant[12].' And then I added, that 'the reparation to be made for all such past mistakes is clear . . . There is need that we acknowledge, heartily and ungrudgingly, the present full political citizenship of all Englishmen alike; that we determine to leave no wrong unredressed, no artificial restriction unabated, no civil or religious disability unrepealed; and even more than this, that we resolve to heal, as far as possible, every social wound[13].'

Not one word of all this do I wish to blur or retract. I would willingly multiply such confessions and such resolves, if it were necessary. And therefore I would fain hope that these passages, here brought under view together, may disarm any future critic who shall be tempted to resent an imaginary statement on my part,

---

[7] *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 3. [8] Infra, p. 424.
[9] p. 32. [10] p. 92. [11] p. 232. [12] p. 277. [13] p. 409.

that 'all the amenities are on the one side and all the discourtesies on the other[14].' The discourtesies—be it remembered—*began* from the Nonconformist side; and they soon reached a virulence of invective, which no one could believe possible till he had studied early Puritan literature. But alas! these coarse and brutal attacks were soon met with an equal coarseness on the part of some Churchmen: and God forbid, that we should now-a-days rake up, on either side, missiles that should never have been used at all.

Again, one word is necessary on another subject. No writer should be accused, without extremely good reason, of *unfairly* abbreviating his quotations. Abbreviation of some sort there must obviously be,—from the simple necessities of typography. But my sincere endeavour has been, in every case, not only to give a *fair* sample of the author's meaning, but also (by asterisks and by careful references) to offer the means of verification to any one who might choose that course. And I must here take leave to say, that no single instance of unfair quotation has been successfully made out against me. The passage most commonly fixed upon has been the citation, on p. 83, from Dr. R. Vaughan's *English Nonconformity*[15]. But that quotation I neither alter nor withdraw. And, appealing to any impartial reader, I say once more that a stronger instance of a good and able man, 'de seditione querentem,' could hardly anywhere be found. The circumstances in New England, which call forth his indignant demand *for* 'strong coercion' from the magistrate, are precisely and in every point parallel to those which, occurring in Old England amid the political and social ferment of Queen Elizabeth's reign, had awakened his indignant protests *against* such coercion.

From Wesleyan Reviewers, and especially from an able and candid writer in the *London Quarterly Review*, I have

[14] *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 5.

[15] E.g. in *The Congregationalist*, Oct. 1872, p. 630; *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 7.

to acknowledge courtesy almost invariably, and sometimes even sympathy. The concluding words of that writer, which have touched my own heart profoundly, I must crave his permission here to quote for the eyes of my brother-Churchmen. 'Methodism is not so entirely gone over to Dissent—using the word in the *technical* meaning he [the Bampton Lecturer] assigns to it—as he seems to fear. Earnest, conscientious, and thorough Dissenters there have always been, and will always be, in the Methodist community; but there is every guarantee that the heart of Methodism will always remember whence it came, the amount of its obligations to the Mother Church, and the sacred duty of doing nothing to widen a breach already wide enough[16].' These words give one some encouragement to hope, not that Wesleyans will one day surrender at discretion to the Church,—a thing which for my part I neither expect nor desire,—but that, as religious men, deeply interested in the lower orders, and not afraid of Church-organization on the grand scale, they will erelong recoil from the Puritan crusade; will refuse to harass the Church of England out of her schools, her endowments, and her time-honoured places of worship; and will remember that the leveller has already cast a jealous eye on the massiveness of the Wesleyan body, and candidly proclaims that 'its vast organic growth, the inordinate accumulation of its material property, and the unity and strength of its wonderful organization make it, at this moment, one of the most perilous possibilities of our ecclesiastical and social life[17].'

What, however, this last writer apparently means to say is,—a truth to which both every Wesleyan and every Churchman would heartily assent,—that organization on the grand scale is always accompanied by certain special and well-known dangers. There is danger of a petrified officialism or bureaucracy creeping in; there is danger of a despotism emerging; there is danger of local self-government, and the moral

[16] *London Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1872, p. 213.

[17] *British Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1873, p. 19.

training that accompanies it, being paralyzed; there is danger lest superstition and 'the divinity that doth hedge' a spiritual leader engender servility and degradation. But the best reply to all such alarms is, that all these dangers also environ a *state;* that it is the very part of science and courage not to be afraid of them, but to make these things balance harmoniously and work together for good; and that, as a state does not commit the absurdity of going into small pieces—like Professor Forbes's suicidal starfish—in order to escape the dangers of a noble and effective existence by an ignoble and despairing self-disintegration, so neither should a church consent to a voluntary disintegration.

Lastly, one word about the charge of 'intestine discord' which is repeatedly, and from the most unexpected quarters, laid at the door of the Church of England[18]. It seems universally agreed among Dissenters, that men must needs differ about the details both of politics and of religion. This being granted, there are only three systems possible: (1) Despotism, which by main force crushes all differences into a dead or else a hypocritical silence; (2) Disintegration, such as e.g. would have paralyzed the American Union by reducing it into a multitude of independent states, or would paralyze England by bringing back the Heptarchy; (3) Liberty, i.e. a constitutional system, which allows free and even violent discussion, prefers noisy open-air debate to either sullen isolation or whispering conspiracy, and yet demands imperatively of the noisy disputants that they hold together, come at length to some tardy and imperfect sort of agreement, and meanwhile break not the unity of the society. Now which of these three methods do Englishmen believe to be the true and effective course for the *state?* and if for the civil, why not for the ecclesiastical polity? It is (we know) only a timid foreigner who

[18] E.g. *Westminster, Review,* Oct. 1872, p. 474; *Theological Review,* Oct. 1872, p. 491; *Christian World,* Sept. 1872 (8th notice); *Congregationalist,* Sept. 1872, p. 556.

flies with terror from an English election scene, and forebodes the impending dissolution of society. What shall we say then of Englishmen, who seem able to understand 'liberty' in a state, but who cannot understand it, or cannot put up with its inevitable accompaniments in a church? And how is it less pardonable for men to shew earnestness about disputable matters and yet to refrain from rendering mutual reconciliation hopeless by a breach of organic unity, than it is to actually break away from each other for conscience sake, and afterwards — every cause of disagreement remaining precisely what it was before—to organize a temporary and hollow alliance, to exchange pulpits, and mutual compliments, and to utter loud professions of brotherly and catholic sentiment? It would surely seem that the former course is the more honourable and more Christian of the two.

How willingly, however, would one leave all these things unsaid! How gladly—if Dissenters would but cease their mischievous efforts to break up the National Church—would she welcome the precious aid that such private 'Societies' of earnest Christians might afford to the life and energy of the whole Christian brotherhood! But it seems to have become impossible, owing to their separation, for Dissenters (with all sincerity of intention) to enter into the mind of the Church on the subject of schism; or to perceive that nine-tenths of their arguments against her proceed on the tacit assumption that their own axioms are indisputably right and hers indisputably wrong. This could be shewn, if necessary, by a hundred quotations. And an English Churchman, maintaining his position at the present day against the assaults of Dissenting Ministers in the House of Commons, and against the endless misstatements of hostile orators elsewhere, may well (with St. Paul) exclaim, 'I am become a fool in glorying; ye have compelled me.'

If, amid the gathering tempest of a deadly Atheism, engendered by the supposed discovery of a universal 'reign of law,' we are compelled to exhaust ourselves with trifling disputes about the divine right of pew-

rents or the urgent need of a chimerical 'equality'—we really must be allowed to plead that the fault does not rest with us. If, when the world is loudly demanding how, amid a hundred false religions and a score of legendary bibles, to defend the true Religion and the true Bible, we are dragged down into such miserable platitudes as the difference between tithes and taxes,—it is not surely we who are guilty of thus weakening the cause of God in this land. If, while half the nation is being degraded by ignorance and strong drink, and degenerated by sensuous impurity, and impoverished by the ever imminent danger of war and brutal violence, the Christian agencies of this country are distracted with mutual jealousies and with gratuitously inflicted anxieties about house and home and a place to teach and worship in,—again this misfortune is not attributable to the Church of England. She has, indeed, abundant faults to answer for, and must on many counts plead 'verily guilty concerning the brethren' committed to her charge. But I do not think any competent or candid judge would allow the Ministry of any other Communion in this land to aver that they were wholly without blame. And therefore the loyal sons of the Church of England may, surely, employ in her behalf the words of our all-merciful Lord: 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.'

# CONTENTS.

## LECTURE I.

### DISSENT IN GENERAL.

Matt. xiii. 3, 4.

PAGE

*A sower went forth to sow: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side* . . . . . 1

APPENDIX A. List of the more important 'dissensions' within the Church; from A.D. 30 to the present time . 34

## LECTURE II.

### THE INDEPENDENTS.

Ephes. v. 21.

*Submitting yourselves one to another, in the fear of God* . 37

APPENDIX B. The Presbyterian 'Confession of Faith' . 121

APPENDIX C. The Independent 'Declaration of Faith, Church Order, and Discipline' . . . . . 125

## LECTURE III.

### THE ROMANISTS.

1 Peter v. 3.

PAGE

*Neither as being lords over God's heritage; but being ensamples to the flock* . . . . . 131

APPENDIX D. The Romanist Confession of Faith (or the 'Creed of Pope Pius IV.' A.D. 1564) . . . . 202

APPENDIX E. The Canons passed at the Latin Council of the Vatican, A.D. 1870 . . . . . 203

APPENDIX F. 'A Syllabus of the principal errors of our time,—which are stigmatised in the Allocutions, &c. of our most holy Lord, Pope Pius IX.' . . . . 207

## LECTURE IV.

### THE BAPTISTS.

Matthew xiii. 47.

*The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net, which was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind* . . . . 209

APPENDIX G. The Baptist Confessions of Faith . . 242

## LECTURE V.

### THE QUAKERS.

1 Cor. xiv. 32.

PAGE

*The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace* . . 245

APPENDIX H. 'The chief principles of the Christian religion, as professed by the people called Quakers' . . 280

## LECTURE VI.

### THE UNITARIANS.

1 Cor. iii. 18.

*If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise* . . . . 285

APPENDIX I. The metaphysical language of the Church . 335

## LECTURE VII.

### THE WESLEYANS.

Rom. xii. 16.

*Mind not high things: but condescend to men of low estate* . 337

APPENDIX K. The special doctrines of the Wesleyans . 390

APPENDIX L. Extracts from three important documents of Wesleyanism . . . . . 392

## LECTURE VIII.

### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Numbers xxiv. 5, 6.

PAGE

*How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted* . . . . . 395

APPENDIX M. The Organization of the Church of England 433

APPENDIX N. The Endowments of the Church of England 440

# LECTURE I.

## DISSENT IN GENERAL.

'Even in the best state which Society has yet reached, it is lamentable to think how great a proportion of all the efforts and talents in the world are employed in merely neutralizing one another. It is the proper end of government to reduce this wretched *waste* to the smallest possible amount.' (Mill, *Political Economy*, bk. v. ch. xi. § 16.)

# LECTURE I.

## DISSENT IN GENERAL.

'A sower went forth to sow: and as he sowed, some fell by the way side.'
*Matt.* xiii. 3, 4.

NO thoughtful man can possibly contemplate the history of the Church of Christ, without the keenest sense of disappointment. That man's work should fail, and be impaired by loss and waste, would be but little matter of surprise. That God's work should be thus impaired and obstructed, is indeed—at first sight—astonishing. And yet our Lord, in the words which I have just quoted in the text, distinctly recognizes this fact; and His words ought to have prepared our minds to receive it. Nay, ordinary observation too should come to our aid. For it corroborates beyond all question the truth, that the Almighty has not chosen to shield even His own works from the operation of the causes which produce loss and waste; nor (in other words) thought fit so far to subordinate all other considerations to the carrying out of some one leading idea, that no unemployed material shall be left for fulfilling the collateral purposes of His providence. If then in the Church itself —which the Christian believes to be the special object of God's care, and to which the promise belongs, 'Lo, I

am with you always, even unto the end of the world[1]'—a strange waste of power is visible, and a friction of contending forces which sometimes brings the machine almost to a stop, there is no reason after all to feel much surprise.

For, in fact, the world is full of what we call 'waste;' and the ideas of God never seem to gain their victory without loss. Jesus Himself only triumphed through temporary defeat and death. 'The Son of Man must needs suffer.' And even in the material world, the Manichees perhaps were not far wrong in seeing everywhere the same phenomenon—a *Jesus patibilis* struggling out of bondage into freedom, out of darkness into light. Thus, when the mineral constituents of the earth had been sorted and rearranged by chemical and mechanical forces—then plant-life, like the bright dawn of a new and Divine idea, irradiated them and raised them to a higher power[2]. And yet, down to this very day, vast wastes of torrid sand and ice-bound zones of desolation keep almost all plant-life at bay, and defy every effort of the vegetable world to get a footing there. And so again, when plants had spread and clothed the earth with marvellous beauty—then animal life, like yet a new idea, appeared among them, to transmute matter still higher into sense and motion[3]. And yet among animals and plants alike what enormous waste and loss

[1] *Matt.* xxviii. 20.

[2] 'In our atmosphere floats carbonic acid gas... The sunlight [by the shock of its vibrations] loosens the molecules of the carbonic acid; and incipient disunion being thus introduced, the carbon of the gas is seized upon by the leaf and appropriated,—while the oxygen is discharged into the atmosphere.' (Prof. Tyndall, *Fortn. Review*, Feb. 1, 1869.)

[3] 'Thus the vegetable world builds up from these forms—and from some which are simpler — all the protoplasm which keeps the animal world agoing.' (Prof. Huxley, *ibid.*) 'When all is on the verge of final decomposition into the elementary gases, and so returning from the organic to the inorganic world, these invisible police [the Infusoria] are everywhere ready to arrest the fugitive organic particles, and turn them back into the ascending stream of organic life.' (Prof. Owen, ap. Somerville's *Molecular Science*, ii. p. 80.)

is every moment occurring. The spotted orchis produces (it is computed) some 180,000 seeds each summer: yet frequently not one of them germinates[4]. The white ant is said to lay, at certain periods, 80,000 eggs a day: but the young are destroyed by tens of thousands as soon as they are hatched[5]. And so it is, once more, when man appears upon the scene. Waste and loss invariably accompany all he is and does,—even when he associates in churches, under the direct command and for the special purposes of his Maker.

Instead therefore of indulging ourselves in wonder and disgust (as we are tempted to do), at the confused aspect and abortive efforts which meet our eye everywhere—even within the Church of God—the part of wisdom surely is, to acknowledge that God's ways are not as our ways, to believe that this confusion may have a meaning to His eye which it has not to ours, and to try and enter into that meaning and recognize with humility that higher order which to us at first seemed chaos.

In the hope of being serviceable in this direction to some, who are (it may be) perplexed and in despair at the strange ecclesiastical confusions of our times, I have ventured to take for the subject of these eight Lectures the difficult, yet surely pressing, question of DISSENT, especially as it now appears in England. I am well aware how impossible it is to say anything new upon so well-worn a theme. Nor do I expect to be of the slightest use to any but to those, whose engagements

[4] 'I took a ripe capsule of Cephalanthera grandiflora . . The four capsules on this one plant contained 24,000 seeds. Orchis maculata 186,300.' At this rate, 'the great grandchildren of a single plant would clothe the entire land throughout the globe . . Yet it is notorious that orchids are sparingly distributed.' (Darwin, *Fertilization of Orchids*, p. 344.) See Bp. Butler's well-known observations on the same subject, *Anal.* part i. cap. v.

[5] See Hardwicke's *Science Gossip*, No. 73 (Jan. 1871).

in quite other directions lead them to feel the need of common information on a dark and perplexing subject. For I well know how repulsive a topic this is to ordinary men; how impatiently its dry details and apparently senseless polemics are thrown aside[6]. And I also know with what a strange unconscious dishonesty the facts of history are perpetually distorted or obscured, even by well-meaning writers, to serve a purpose.

In dealing with this subject then, I shall endeavour, in the first Lecture, to give (as clearly and briefly as I can) a *general view* of the whole question; and by a rapid examination of the phenomena attending upon schisms, and of the methods taken to heal them, during the centuries preceding the Reformation, I shall seek to arrive at some principles which may guide us in studying the modern and English forms of Dissent, with which we are all more or less acquainted. In the following six Lectures, I shall take *six of the leading English denominations* for a more special study. And in the last Lecture, I shall conclude with a review of the condition and prospects of *our own Church*, with relation to these surrounding bodies, which are exercising such an important influence upon her path.

And may it be our earnest endeavour to seek for nothing but the truth: may we recognize thankfully,

[6] No one can be surprised to find that this is the case among politicians, journalists, and men of the world, when we find an able and vigorous leader of Dissent making the following confession: 'I am as tired as any man of Sect-life; of this and the other portion of the body becoming a separated limb; men combining together on this and the other point or points, one or five as the case may be .. I am tired of all this and have long been so.' (Binney, *Church Life in Australia*, p. 112.) But if Mr. Binney is 'tired,' what does he think that Churchmen feel, who were tired of Puritan contentions already three hundred years ago? 'Far more comfort were it for us (so small is the joy we feel in these strifes) to labour under the same yoke .. rather than in such dismembered sort to spend our few and wretched days in a tedious prosecuting of wearisome contentions.' (Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, Preface, sub fin.)

wherever we shall find it, every trace of zeal and love and of the Holy Spirit's working: and both say and feel, with the noble liberality of a St. Augustine, 'Quisquis bonus verusque Christianus est, Domini sui esse intelligat ubique invenerit veritatem[7].'

I. What then *is* 'Dissent?' It has been the fashion to confuse this subject. And no doubt, in far distant times, quite other forms and denominations prevailed than those to which we are accustomed; and rude fierce ages of delirious controversy branded every opponent on every side of every question with the very harshest names that tongue could frame. 'Heresy and schism,' 'madness,' 'impiety,' 'blasphemy,' and so forth, were some of the lighter and more courteous missiles thought good enough to employ in religious warfare. But we are learning, I suppose, at last a better and more Christian system of managing our controversies. We are no longer unwilling to be taught two great maxims, one of which was often in the mouth of Dr. Arnold of Rugby[8], and the other is due to Bishop Dupanloup of Orleans[9]: viz. *first*, that the true way of disarming error is by a diligent teaching of the correlative truth; and *secondly*, that it is not worth while to convert merely family disputes into questions of life and death. Passing by therefore, as unworthy of attention, both the hostile

[7] Aug. *de Doctr.* ii. 18: (cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 46: Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 3, 20, &c., &c.) Has not this noble breadth and freedom been the true characteristic of the Catholic Church in all ages? It is a thing totally distinct both from eclecticism and from indifference to truth.

[8] 'Nothing can or ought to be done by merely maintaining negatives. I will neither talk nor write (if I can help it) *against* Newmanism, but *for* the true Church and Christianity.' (Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, i. 149, first ed.) So Dean Stanley himself, *The Apostolical Age*, p. 201; and Bp. Jebb, *Pastoral Instructions*, p. 26.

[9] 'Chrétiens! aimez toujours, pardonnez toujours.. Ne changeons pas en questions vitales les querelles de ménage.' (*Discourse on Education*, at Malines, Aug. 1864, p. 85.)

and the complimentary systems of nomenclature, and seeking nothing but clearness and truth, we find the facts to be simply these: (1) that in all ages and countries where the Christian Church has found a footing, there have *always* (from the very construction of the human mind) arisen parties in opposition to the prevailing and authorized methods, both of doctrine and of discipline: (2) that this opposition and its resulting conflict is, in the ecclesiastical as well as every other kind of polity, the essential *condition of vitality* and movement: (3) but that, while 'dissension' is both healthy and inevitable, yet when it runs out into extreme forms, becomes exasperated by mismanagement or poisoned by the admixture of hatred, jealousy, and selfwill, it then becomes a dangerous and *chronic disease*[10]; it has grown into something which cannot easily be cured; a chasm has opened, which renders re-absorption very difficult; and dissension (in one word) has ripened into 'Dissent.'

'Dissent,' then, is the ripened or chronic form of a thing which in itself is often both natural and right, viz. dissatisfaction with the existing doctrines or practices of the Church. If doctrine were mainly in question, it was usual in past times to call this kind of Dissent by the name of 'heresy.' If discipline and practical order were mainly in question, another title was employed, viz. 'schism[11].' But the two things are, essentially and at bottom, the same.

---

[10] 'A spirit of "watchful jealousy" is as much a spiritual hindrance,—nay, in the view of Christianity it is even a more direct spiritual hindrance,—than drunkenness or loose living. Christianity is, first and above all, a temper, a disposition .. Where there is jealousy and strife among you, asks St. Paul, *are ye not carnal?*.. Therefore, says he, "I exhort you by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be not divisions among you."' (M. Arnold, *St. Paul and Protestantism*, p. xxii.)

[11] 'Cum "schismaticus" sis sacrilegâ discessione, et "hæreticus" sacrilego dogmate.' (Aug. *c. Gaudentium*, ii. 9.)

II. And now let us cast our eyes over the broad field of Church history, and ask two or three important and, I think, not uninteresting questions. First, inasmuch as this phenomenon of 'Dissent' seems always to have accompanied the life of the Church, did it or did it not form part of the original *Idea of the Church* in the mind of our blessed Lord? Because, if it did, it is legitimate; if it did not, it is illegitimate, and must be wrong, however common and (humanly speaking) inevitable it may be. For things do not establish a right to exist, by existing. War exists, slavery exists, ignorance exists. But we are not pantheists, so as to recognize everything that exists, as divine; nor probably if we were, should we feel ourselves, in practice, precluded from doing all in our power to abate these fearful scourges, lest perchance we should be 'found fighters against God.' No; the faith of mankind has not so far evaporated into sentiment, but that we find courage to do battle in God's name against terrible evils that afflict us; evils that, we are sure, are contrary to His will and out of keeping with the Ideal which (if we may so say) floats before His mind, even though they do by His permission exist.

And so it is in the present case. 'Dissent' exists; but it does not therefore follow that it *ought* to exist, until we have ascertained the mind of Christ. And to ascertain that, we must go to the best and purest sources accessible to us; viz. the only extant relics of His life and teaching, contained in the writings of His apostles. And what do we find there that our blessed Lord and Saviour said about the Church?

I have heard people reply—and it surely is a most curious instance how entirely the eye is dependent upon previously acquired powers of seeing—that there is

almost absolutely nothing about the Church in all the recorded words of our Lord[12]! Can anything be more strange? First of all, what (let us ask) was the employment and purpose of His whole three years' ministry? Was it to *preach the Gospel* in person to every creature? We know that it was not. His Gospel is for all the world; yet He never Himself overstepped the borders of Palestine. 'There is no man that doeth anything in secret' (said His unbelieving brothers), 'and yet he himself seeketh to be known openly.' Quite true; and if, therefore, Jesus hid Himself, forbade His disciples to speak of His claims, and declared His 'hour was not come' till the very eve of His departure, at Gethsemane, it is clear He was *not* seeking to be known openly.

Was it, then, to bequeath *a Book* to the world that His efforts were directed? Not so. He neither wrote one single line Himself, nor ever mentioned in any of His recorded sayings so much as one word about the subject; nor was one letter of the New Testament ever set down on paper till some twenty years or more after His Ascension.

But, perhaps, He desired to complete *a Theological system*, and to leave (what may be called) a regular religion in the world? This is a thing quite possible to do. It had been done before our Lord's time by Buddha and Zoroaster. It has been done since our

[12] 'Christ's spirit, Christ's virtue is the only essential thing. . . . In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus said nothing about the Church.' (Channing, *Works*, i. 263.) 'Nonconformists reply, that they know nothing of that corporate entity suspended by theological theorists between heaven and earth. They know organizations on earth of those who profess and call themselves Christians, and they know of an innumerable company who are citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem. But of that metaphysical abstraction which is called by some "the Church," they find no record in Scripture.' (*Religious Republics*, p. 227.)

Lord's time by Mahomet, and by Joseph Smith, and by Comte. But then there is not the smallest indication of any such attempt in the Gospels. Whatever else may be there, we find at least no dogmatic system there unfolded; no Creeds, no Articles, no 'Catechisms,' longer or shorter, no 'Summa Theologiæ,' no 'Body of Divinity.' All is divine and pregnant chaos, awaiting the movement of the Spirit upon the waters.

But there is one more alternative. Perhaps it was *a Sentiment* that He left behind; a pleasing and soothing remembrance of One who had walked this world in peace and benevolence and calm union with the will of God, and had succumbed at last to an agonizing death and to the same tremendous mystery which overpowers us all, viz. the superiority of the physical to the moral on this globe:—succumbed without a murmur, but without an explanation! Surely I need not say, if this were all, that not only may other idyllic poets and stoical philosophers sustain fair claims to competition, but also, that large portions of the Lord's acts and words remain thus entirely unaccounted for. His greatest efforts seem then to have been wasted; and those things which evidently lay nearest His heart were just the things which have since appeared to be useless, or even pernicious, to the Idyll[13].

[13] Observe how, in that most elaborate of all the mere artistic perversions of the Gospel, the *Vie de Jésus*, by M. Renan, the artist would willingly rid himself, if he could, of some of our Lord's great miracles, of the Resurrection, of His frequent announcements of the second advent. While, on the other hand, the part borne by the Blessed Virgin and by other female characters is overdrawn, the scenery overcoloured, and the contrast between the stage-grandeur of the Master and the bucolic simplicity of the disciples is exaggerated. Art, in short, with all its 'fonction religieuse supérieure à celle du théologien,' (Renan, *Études*, p. 430,) cannot by itself compass the setting forth of the Gospel. And M. Renan's πρῶτον ψεῦδος is fatal to his whole work, viz. that 'la *beauté* vaut presque le bien et le vrai.'

No; these explanations of His life and work on earth will satisfy no candid inquirer. It was something else that He was doing. It was some better shrine and casket that He was preparing, to bear and radiate forth His Holy Spirit among men, than any of these mere human and often tried contrivances. And so when, with humbler and more docile eyes, we turn once more to the portraiture of that Divine Life, we find new things undreamed of hitherto in man's philosophy. We see, for background of the portrait, a world grown old in iniquity, a moral chaos of despair and effete mummery. We see a tiger-king deluging Palestine with seas of blood, the civil wars of Rome setting every man's hand against his brother, the Empire stamping out everywhere the last sparks of national life, a Cicero smiling at his brother augurs, a Lucretius preaching earnest atheism, a Horace gaily singing that the gods lived easy lives and cared not for men, and temples (accordingly) being built up in every land, not by piety to God, but by flattery and hypocrisy to Cæsar.

And now amid this dismal scene, behold—like yet a ray of new-creative light from heaven—a lovely fresh Ideal, descending down from God upon earth. No human eye had ever yet beheld the way in which God interferes in the world that He has made, when He intends to create a new beginning. But here the mystery was actually before men's eyes, although they knew it not. In stillness and in secret it stole into the world. A Child was born at Bethlehem. And for thirty years none but she who 'kept all His sayings and pondered them in her heart,' seemed to have much idea that here was the ripe fruit of all the ages, here the teeming germ of all the future. Yet so it was. And a ministry of three short years sufficed to prepare all

the means that were necessary for the expansion of the germ, for the communication of new life gradually throughout the world, and for inundating with a flood of the noblest ideas—of courage before God, of brotherhood with man, of fearlessness before nature[14]—the tide-forsaken shores of humanity.

How was it prepared? What was the potent instrument which the Lord left on earth, for embodying and giving tangible effect to His Holy Spirit's presence in the world after His own Ascension? It was simply that wonderful, elastic, undying, expansive thing which we in England know so well, which we use ourselves with such exceptional vigour and skill—a polity, a SOCIETY, a united brotherhood, a 'kingdom of heaven' among men.

Yes; it was to the training and preparation of an evangelizing *society* that the whole of His short ministry seems to have been devoted. 'Follow Me,' said He on first gathering to Him a knot of disciples, 'and I will make you fishers of men[15]:' 'Go ye,' were His last

[14] What the need of some reassurance must have been in times past, we may judge not only from the myths and histories which have come down to us, but from what is being suffered by Asiatics and felt by Europeans even at the present moment. 'A very singular report has been recently issued by the *Gazette of India* upon the number of deaths from the attacks of wild beasts. . . A man-eating tiger creates such terror in a district, that whole villages are depopulated. The aggregate number of deaths by the onslaught of wild beasts, for three years, amounts to 12,554. The deaths from snake-bite come up to 25,664.' (*Daily News*, Nov. 1, 1871.) Take another Eastern country: 'In 1863 [in Java], 273 people were eaten by tigers, 158 by crocodiles, 72 were crushed by rhinoceroses, 22 died by serpents. The thunders of heaven too joined in this earthly battue, and destroyed 493 human beings.' (Marq. de Beauvoir's *Voyage round the World*, ii. 141.) 'Should it ever be your misfortune to see a Christian gentleman, your friend and equal, pulled down by a fierce brute mad with famine, . . though you may have the luck to slay the slayer, still a bewildering horror will chill the triumph of your vengeance, and you will be furnished with something to wonder over and think about for the rest of your days.' (Major Holland, in *Science Gossip*, Dec. 1871.)

[15] *Matt.* iv. 19.

instructions, 'into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature[16]:' here, then, we have the end and object of His society set forth.

'And when He had called His twelve disciples, He gave them power . . . and sent them forth[17],' adding a long instruction as to their conduct on this trial mission: 'And the Apostles, when they were returned, told Him all that they had done; and He took them and went aside privately into a desert place[18]:' 'And with many parables spake He the Word unto them . . . and when they were alone, He expounded all things to His disciples[19].' Here, it is beyond question, that He was engaged in training the officers of His future Church.

And what was that Church to be like? Parable after parable and discourse after discourse are taken up with a full explanation of this matter. 'The kingdom of heaven'—such was its title on His lips, borrowed from the prophecy of Daniel—'is like unto mustard seed:' there are its small beginnings. 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven:' there is the secret chemistry of its working. 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a field,' where tares are mingled with the wheat, and are not to be separated until the harvest-day: 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net,' which gathered of every kind, both good and bad alike[20]: The kingdom of heaven is like unto a wedding-feast, to which people of all sorts were invited, and where some were present, even till the coming back of the king, without the wedding garment[21]: there is its tolerance of sinners, its breadth, its noble fearlessness of infection in carrying out His work of redeeming mercy. 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on

[16] *Mark* xvi. 15.
[17] *Matt.* x. 1.
[18] *Luke* x. 10.
[19] *Mark* iv. 34.
[20] *Matt.* xiii. 31–50.
[21] *Ibid.* xxii. 2.

earth, shall be bound in heaven[22]:' 'If a man hear not the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican[23]:' there is its authority. 'I pray that they all may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me[24]:' there is its unity. Such was our Lord's description of His Church.

It seems impossible, then, to come to any other conclusions than the following:—First, that what our Lord intended to leave in the world was a *society;* beginning from a small germ and developing itself far and wide; commissioned expressly to take the largest possible sweep for embracing multitudes of every kind, whoever could any way be persuaded to come in[25]; and with the distinct function assigned it, of gathering in the weak, the young, the ignorant,—rather than of forming any sort of privileged club, from which all such imperfect persons were to be excluded.

Secondly, that it was to be no chaos, but an *organizea* society. The incarnate order and reason of the universe was not likely (we may be sure) to bequeath to us an anarchy. And we have seen how He Himself carefully selected and personally commissioned the first

[22] *Matt.* xvi. 19.

[23] *Ibid.* xviii. 17.

[24] *John* xvii. 21.

[25] And yet, in the face of our Lord's own description of His own Church, Calvinists can venture to use such language as the following:—'Are these villains members of Christ? If so, Christ had sadly altered since the day when He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. Has He really taken baptized drunkards and harlots to be members of His body?' (Spurgeon, *Sermon on Baptismal Regeneration*, p. 318.) And yet, it seems, 'The purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error.' (*The Baptist Confession of Faith*, Spurgeon's edition, p. 28.) The columns of the daily newspapers, indeed, not unfrequently corroborate this statement; and, so far, bear out the Church's doctrine on this subject, as it is laid down by Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, iii. 1, 7, and by St. Augustine, who thus chastises the Pharisaism of the Donatists: 'Hi "exterminant oleum suavitatis," qui non ipsam Dei gratiam, sed hominum mores, intuentur; et quoniam, sicut grana inter paleas non videntur, ita piè viventes inter iniquorum turbas non facile apparent, carnaliter offensi . . . resiliunt.' (*c. lit. Parmen.* ii. x. 22.)

office-bearers in His new kingdom, for the special purpose He had in view.

Thirdly, that this purpose was, simply and purely an *educational* one. The society was, above all other things, not to be exclusive and selfish, as if for enjoyment. It was to be a self-forgetting, self-hazarding agent of His own vast and expansive charity. And therefore, like Himself, it was not to stop and ask if this man were a publican or that man a Samaritan; but to gather up its armfuls of the strayed, the lost, the weak, the young,—the victims of nature, of man, of their own passions or folly,—and to 'set them once more among princes,' by giving them a home, with love and training in it, and all that makes men human, cheerful, healthful, and (in the best and highest sense) natural[26].

Fourthly, that the ultimate object of all this machinery was, not to create (in any sense whatever) a privileged class; not to maintain a hierarchy or an endowed establishment for their own sakes; (God forbid!) but simply the pure and Christian purpose of *saving souls*, —of sealing down upon them, when the wax is hot, the impression of Christianity; stamping it down in sacraments, and rituals, and lessons, and sermons; and setting before them a visible example of the peace and joy and health that dwell in His household, and are the natural inheritance of His children.

III. And now, having seen what the Church was to be like according to the mind of Christ, let us look round on Christendom, and especially on our own country, and compare this picture with that.

[26] 'To allow no more to this superior principle or part of our nature, than to other parts,—this is *not* to act conformably to the constitution of man. Neither can any human creature be said to act conformably to his constitution of 'nature,' unless he allows to that superior principle the absolute authority which is due to it.' (Bp. Butler, *Sermons*, p. xv.)

For indeed it is high time to disabuse ourselves of prejudices in our own favour. It is high time that we all,—we Christians who profess to be the salt of the world, and yet are in imminent danger of losing our savour and being trodden under foot of men,—should confess to God and to each other our shortcomings and the miserable failure which, for many a century, His great organ for the conversion of the world has become in our hands[27].

The conversion of the world! Why, the question bids fair to become positively reversed; and mankind are beginning scoffingly or seriously to ask, not how soon Christianity promises to overspread the world, but how soon the world will succeed in overpowering and superseding Christianity. Amid the wide spaces of unreclaimed heathendom, missions languish and not unfrequently die. China meets a Christianity presented to it in forms of gross superstition by a still grosser outbreak of rancour and abhorrence. Africa throws the very Church that would convert her into convulsions, by the hard plain common sense of a Zulu herdsman. Even New Zealand breaks up the surface of her otherwise well-established Christianity by an earthquake of long-repressed fanaticism[28]. India, where

[27] 'By these means we are grown hateful in the eyes of the heathens themselves . . . and what we object one against another, the same they use to the utter scorn and disgrace of us all. This we have gained by our mutual home-dissensions.' (Greg. Naz. ap. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Preface, sub fin.) 'Quand de tels hommes n'auraient contre eux que leurs divisions, il n'en faudrait pas davantage pour les frapper d'impuissance. Anglicans . . . Methodistes, Baptistes, Puritains, Quakers &c.—c'est à ce peuple que les infidèles ont affaire!' (De Maistre, *Du Pape*, p. 239.)

[28] Cf. Meade's *New Zealand* (1864), pp. 94, 168: 'Too often it is not only the Gospel of Christ and His Apostles, the few essentials of Christianity, which are insisted upon by our missionaries, but those essentially dressed in English traditions,—the traditions, that is, of a cold, proud, unaccommodating race.' (*Mission Life*, Feb. 1871, p. 142.)

every sect has found an open field, and where vast revenues of English gold are every year employed on missions, bids fair to transmute the Gospel into a sort of Deism, and to re-act with a very unexpected energy upon the Church at home[29]. And meanwhile in the Levant, the ancient Eastern Church sits immutable and therefore powerless: isolation and ultra-conservatism have frozen up her life. In Europe, the miserable spectacle has just been seen of a clerical despotism crowning, by just chastisement, the chronic efforts of a part of Christendom to assign to itself the attributes of the whole. While in America, thoughtful men are wondering what strange monstrous birth the existing chaos both of speculation and of ecclesiastical polity may, at no very distant day, bring forth.

And what shall we say of our own country, and of Christianity as it is presented and organized among ourselves? Can any man, of any sect or of any school of opinions, say he is satisfied with things as they are? that religion in England seems to him to have taken just such a form as the great Head and Founder of the Church would most desire, and on which His eye must

[29] 'The preaching of the missionaries in the streets of Bombay greatly impressed me. At the appointed hour we went to the American chapel, from the doorsteps of which the Rev. Mr. Bowen has preached every week for more than a quarter of a century. He is, I think, practically identified with the Independents. He is one of the best known and most honoured men in Bombay. In order to convince the natives of the unselfishness of his motives, he has lived for years as poorly as themselves, refusing all official pay. . . . He himself frankly confessed that, as far as he knew, he had never made a single convert.' (Macleod, *Peeps at the far East*, 1871, p. 48.) Placing in the opposite scale all that can be said by Sir Bartle Frere in his interesting paper on 'Indian Missions' (in Weir's *Church and the Age*, p. 317), still, is it not manifest that we have not yet discovered the true method of missions? May the writer be permitted to refer to a published University Sermon, on *The Evangelization of India* (Parker, 1857), where the subject is more fully discussed? For the new 'Brahmo Somaj,' cf. Macleod, p. 243, and Chunder Sen's Lectures.

rest, as the world revolves beneath Him, with (at last) an unclouded smile of perfect satisfaction?

We all know too well the facts of the case, to think so for a moment. We all suspect too surely the diseases that are threatening the very existence of any organized Christianity at all in this country. And we hasten, therefore, with a feverish haste that betrays the secret misgivings of our hearts, to simulate health by agitation and an often aimless activity, or else by a vulgar ostentation of freedom and spontaneous impulses, whose genuineness lies open to suspicion. I am not speaking of the Church of England only,—but of English Christendom, and of Christ's religion as it has come, in course of time, to take organic shape and to present itself before the eyes of God and man, in these islands. And the simple facts are these: first of all, that nearly one-third of the adult population of this country rejects the ministrations of all the sects and of all the Christian organizations alike[30]; and that this third comprises in it, not merely the waifs and strays of every class in society, the careless and unbelieving and backsliding units which of course will always have to be made allowance for in every part of Christendom, but—what is far more startling, and should arrest the attention of every thoughtful man—almost the whole of one large class of society, and that the class which has just attained supreme political power. For, it seems, there is no reasonable doubt, that the working class, as a whole, is alienated from Christianity in its present forms. Not that it is alienated from essential Christianity or from Christ. Nothing could be further from the truth[31]. Nor

[30] 5,288,294 persons, according to Mann's *Census Report* for 1851, p. 93.

[31] 'That it would in some respects be better for the working-classes if they attended places of worship in the same degree that others do, may

is it alienated nearly so far from the Church of England and its daughter society the Wesleyan body, as from the smaller and more exclusive Dissenting systems. But still, dislike and neglect of all our systems are too manifestly displayed to be for a moment mistaken by any unbiassed observer.

The next startling fact which meets us, in contemplating the religious phenomena of our times, is the strange impotence which has befallen us in the department of theology. A score of new sciences have arisen within the last fifty years, and as yet no Christian society in this land has displayed the least ability to deal with them. Large views seem to have been almost entirely wanting. And while questions have been raised of the very deepest significance and interest to every Christian man,—questions as to the relation of Scripture to science, the relations of man to the lower animals, the criteria by which history may be disengaged from legend, and a hundred more, whose solution affects at once the dearest hopes and profoundest fears of Christendom, — no reply has yet been heard, which soared above the thick mephitic atmosphere of party-controversy, or which did not give the impression of addressing itself, not to the question, but (in tones now of defiant rebellion, now of complacent concurrence) to some ecclesiastical *coterie*. The Old Testament, for instance, has either been defended in the most indiscri-

be freely conceded. But to say of them, because they do not, they have no real religion or true Christianity, is on the part of those indulging in such utterances, saying (in periphrastic language) that they know nothing whatever of the working-classes . . . Their non-attendance at places of worship has not the grave meaning which even many of the more charitably inclined in other classes attach to it; and the reasons for it are simple and not far to seek. To many of the poor and uneducated, as well as to many of the rich and educated, the actualities of public worship are repellent rather than attractive.' (*Contemporary Review*, December, 1871: article by a journeyman engineer, p. 85.)

minate way to the very letter, or else has been torn up, leaf by leaf, before our astonished eyes. Timidity and rashness, in short, on almost all important theological questions, are in full possession of our camp.

Arrested then by these two startling facts, which mark with so perilous a note of failure the Christianity of our time and country, the student of modern Church history feels compelled to ask,—is there not yet some third fact to be observed, which may offer a clue to explain these strange and (apparently) causeless symptoms of decrepitude? Else why should an industrial class, which is disposed to believe in every essential doctrine of Christianity, be indisposed to join any Christian communion? And why should Christian communities, whose very first principle is sincerity and truth, thus palter with the most interesting questions and give place so readily to the evil spirit of insincerity and prevarication?

The answer is, that there does exist yet a third characteristic of our modern Christendom, which will in a great measure account for the other two. And therefore if any ecclesiastical question can claim precedence as the leading question of the day, it is this; and no pains or time can possibly be thrown away which may lead towards a solution of its difficulties. This third and master characteristic of our modern Christendom is its *fratricidal dissensions.* Unity, which the Lord and Founder of the household made the distinguishing mark of His kingdom and the first condition of its missionary success, is positively thrown aside, as a thing of no importance whatever. Nay, some Christians have become so confirmed and rooted in habits of disagreement, that they have actually learned at last to 'glory in their shame;' and exercise great ingenuity in inventing baseless and unchristian theories to fit and justify existing facts.

But no theory can fit or justify these facts, except the theory that the Lord knew not His own meaning; and that,—after planting in the world an institution wherein His holy spirit of love and peace and mutual good-will should percolate freely, like vital air, athwart every social barrier and through every political boundary,—He is now quite well pleased to behold the miserable network of jealousy, envy, dissension, and mutual obstruction which have parted His Church asunder. Broadcast over this land are scattered no less than 30,000 Dissenting places of worship[32]. And on the day set apart for peace and sweet communion and for 'walking in the House of God as friends,' Heaven looks down upon the astonishing spectacle of this English Christendom of ours split into two great separate streams. Five millions of people are issuing from their homes to-day, as members of a great united Church, bound with unnumbered subtle ties of common feelings, common customs, a common history, and a common interchangeable use of buildings, sacraments, and other ministries and helps to the higher life. While, on the other hand, a second five millions of people are issuing forth, to break up at once into no less than seventy-five different runlets[33],—each taking its own course apart, each worshipping in private buildings of its own, each going aside with some cherished dogma, or some time-honoured grievance of its own, and seeking a growth in all meek and heavenly graces by submitting to customs strictly of its own devising, and listening to teachers rigorously of its own selection.

'Brethren'—surely some holy man of God would say, if with unaccustomed eyes, and therefore with unhardened heart, he could witness this scene—'I wot that through

[32] Mann's *Census Report*, 1851, p. 83, gives 34,467.
[33] *Ibid.* pp. 106, 108.

ignorance ye did it; as did also your fathers. But nevertheless, be ye sure of this, that you have been crucifying your Lord afresh by your unholy dissensions, and putting Him and His cause, before a keen and sarcastic crowd of secularists, sceptics, and heathens, to an open shame.' Indeed, were not our feelings blunted and our consciences seared by the perpetual recurrence of this most miserable scene, it is hard to imagine how any one who loves his Saviour and 'owes to Him his own soul also,'—be he Churchman or Dissenter—could go to sleep at night without resolving that, come what may, his own conscience at least shall be free henceforth; and that no day shall pass in future without some effort made, some prayer put up, some word or act of charity and peace attempted, which may help to abate so dreadful a scandal, to remedy so shocking a disease as this, which after 1800 years is destroying the efficiency and threatening the life of the Church of Christ. Have we learnt nothing, and forgotten nothing, during all this long period of accumulating ecclesiastical experience, that we can think of no better way of managing our intestine quarrels than our fathers did, in the fourth or the fourteenth century? Can we still conceive of nothing better than *compulsion* on the one hand, and *obstruction* on the other? or are we about to throw up the problem in despair, and agree, not merely to differ—that men must always do—but to separate? Especially when we remember what severe things are said in Holy Scripture about 'those that separate themselves[34];' how, in a deeply touching passage, the temper which stands up defiantly upon its rights is said to be diametrically opposite to 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus[35];' and how διχοστασία, the

[34] *Jude* 19.

[35] *Phil. passim*, esp. ii. 5.

spirit of non-conformity, the act of standing apart from one's brethren, is unsparingly and repeatedly chastised by St. Paul[36] as a thing to be rebuked, a carnal sin, a childish petulance, one among the 'manifest works of the flesh.'

IV. Yet no one can read the long previous history of the Church, without finding there abundant warnings both of what we ought to remember, and what we ought to forget, in our dealings with these post-Reformation forms of 'Dissent.' And, though it would be tedious to go through all in detail, we may well occupy a short time in examining two or three of the most instructive cases.

(1) Take, e.g., the very earliest dissension which broke out in the Church. It was that of which we have so many notices on the page of Holy Writ itself, the controversy raised by the Judaizers. And by it, remember, the very dearest interests of all Christendom were imperilled, the very catholicity of the Church came into question, and the approaching failure and explosion of the whole system must have been confidently anticipated by the surrounding Jews and heathens. Observe too, that every well-known symptom of an approaching catastrophe was here. Party leaders (as so often) were put forward against their will: 'I am of Paul, and I of Cephas.' The hardest possible names were used; the opponent was no Apostle, his 'bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible.' The very highest sanctions were pleaded, to prove the duty and reasonableness of separation; appeals to the great mother Church at Jerusalem, appeals to the religious customs of antiquity, appeals (above all) to the authority of Holy Scripture itself and to the express literal commands of God which were there apparently laid down. 'The uncircumcised

[36] *Rom.* xvi. 17; 1 *Cor.* iii. 3; *Gal.* v. 20.

man shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken My covenant.' 'Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you; neither shall ye diminish aught from it.' 'If thou wilt not observe to do all His commandments and statutes which I command thee this day, all these curses shall come upon thee[37].' And yet, in the face of all this fearful storm, we find that the Church did *not*, after all, break up; that dissension was, in the main, prevented from ripening into 'Dissent;' and that, ere fifty years had passed away, the Church was comparatively at peace again, and the two great names that once had adorned the rival banners of all but conflicting 'sects' were inscribed together on all the banners of the reconciled and re-united Church,—'St. Peter and St. Paul[38].'

And how were these, so desirable, yet to us, alas! so hopeless, results attained? They were attained (so far as we can see at this distance of time) by three things alone: First, by the persistent *firmness* of the chief person concerned in maintaining the grand principle which was at stake: secondly, by his equally persistent effort at *conciliation* and at bringing about a mutual understanding: and thirdly, by a recourse to that most obvious means for securing to all sides a hearing, and for committing all parties to the maintenance of a common settlement,—viz. a *conference* or synod[39].

---

[37] *Gen.* xvii. 14; *Deut.* iv. 2, xxviii. 15.

[38] Contrast 1 *Cor.* i. 12 (written A.D. 57), 'I am of Paul, and I of Cephas,' with Clem. Rom. *Epist.* i. § 5 (prob. A.D. 96): 'Let us set before our eyes the good Apostles. Peter, through wicked bigotry, underwent not one, but many labours. . . . Paul too, through bigotry, seven times imprisoned,' &c. Ign. *ad Rom.* § 4 (A.D. 107): 'Not, like Peter and Paul, do I impose commands on you. They were Apostles, I a condemned man,' &c. Irenæus iii. 3. 1 (A.D. 170): 'The Church founded by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul.'

[39] The account of this synod, or, as it is sometimes called, the first 'General Council' at Jerusalem, may be read in the fifteenth chapter of the *Acts of the Apostles.* The result was a compromise. The Gentile converts, at least within the borders of Syria, were required to concede so far to the prejudices of the Jews, as to

(2) We pass on, then, to the next dissension which vexed and endangered the Church. It was the Quartodeciman controversy, an echo and continuation of the former, taking shape in a dispute concerning the time of keeping Easter. Should it be kept (as St. John and the earlier Hebrew Christians had kept it) when the Jews observed their Passover? Or should Christendom stand free from Judaism altogether, cast off the last marks and dregs of that disgraceful origin, and keep Easter always on a Sunday (the day of the Lord's Resurrection) whatever the unbelieving Jews might do? Here, again, was a very serious controversy; for this time Apostolic or (as we might say) New Testament authority might be quoted on both sides, just as the Old Testament scriptures had been freely used before. And yet here again, for the second time, the Church escaped a schism. Dissension there was in abundance, but when the storm was over, it left no fixed 'Dissent' behind. How marvellous and incredible a blessing! Yet, on this occasion, we have the first foreboding indications of what bitter misery was in store for the Church of God. S. Polycarp indeed—a follower of the Asiatic rite—had been, in the middle of the second century, most fairly and courteously treated at Rome; and the Roman Bishop, already the greatest prelate in Christendom, had waived the customs of his see and permitted the venerable Asiatic to consecrate the Eucharist, in proof of harmony between them. But ere twenty years had elapsed, one of those overbearing men of iron uniformity and inexorable discipline had ap-

observe the traditional 'seven precepts of Noah' which were imposed on 'proselytes of the gate:' the Jewish converts were required to cease from imposing circumcision and the keeping of the law on their Gentile brethren.

peared, whose government brings ruin to both states and churches. And (as we all know) Pope Victor could only be restrained from excommunicating Asia Minor by the strong remonstrances of an Ephesian bishop and the earnest labours of Irenæus, the 'peace-maker,' rightly so called. Once more, then, patience and mutual explanations had won the day, and ere long the whole dissension was ready to expire,—the general conference at Nicæa giving an honourable interment to the dead controversy.

And now men might well look round, and ask themselves what, then, had come of all this Judaizing controversy? Had no waste or loss occurred, and, if it had, was the waste pure waste? The answer was, that loss had occurred; that some over-obstinate and over-confident men had gone astray on either side; and, preferring their own ideas of truth and duty to the honourable compromises imposed upon them by the Church, had crossed the barriers of good sense and Christian charity; and so, as Ebionites on the one hand, or Gnostics on the other, had gradually sunk into extravagant and dying 'heresies.' But yet, in the good providence of God, even all this had *not* been pure waste and utter loss to the Church. For it was the very hostility of these foes which had caused her to develope and consolidate her own organization; and from amid the chaos of Gnostic sects there had sprung up—under the inspired guidance of St. John and his immediate disciples[40]—the Episcopal system of the Church, which was destined hereafter to be the unbroken bond of union and guarantee of freedom amid the storms of a thousand years.

[40] 'Ordo Episcoporum, ad originem recensus, in Johannem stabit auctorem.' (Tertullian, *c. Marc.*, iv. 5.)

(3) Yet, though the Episcopate was established, it required yet another violent dissension in the Church, in order to define its powers and functions more completely, and to sketch out the mutual relations of its members among each other. And this was done by the Novatian controversy,—a strange dissension in two successive acts, which broke out about the middle of the third century. It raged first at Carthage in favour of a relaxed discipline, and then at Rome (under the auspices of the same malcontent, Novatus) in favour of a severe discipline. The story is too well known to need repeating here. But its true bearings are not always pointed out. In the first place, it was evidently an expression of the freer spirit, which (let us hope) may always have its place and its honour in the Christian Church, against the too rapidly crystallizing framework of the hierarchy. It is true, that if the mere *occasions* of the two conflicts, as they occurred at Carthage and Rome, be compared together, they appear to have been diametrically opposite to each other. But the real *cause* at the bottom of each was the same. At Carthage, a Roman man of business, of high and noble character, had been converted in middle life and was now made bishop by the popular enthusiasm. He was just the man therefore to have strong ideas of government and order, and to carry the powers of his Episcopate to a considerable height; and so, when one of the Carthaginian presbyters proceeded to ordain his own deacon, Cyprian at once extinguished so dangerous a relic of the old Presbyterian rights, by putting his veto on his whole proceeding [41]. Soon after,

[41] This appears to be the only intelligible account of the matter. For it is agreed on all hands, that to Cyprian is due a considerable strengthening of the Church's organization,—which is as much as to say, it was somewhat weak and imperfect before; and the contem-

when the deacons at Carthage were preparing (as was then usual) to administer the Church funds on their own responsibility, Cyprian again interfered and reduced the Diaconate too under the central authority of the Bishop, by sending four commissioners of his own to superintend the management of the funds. Of course, a dangerous dissension at once broke out. Cyprian seems to have behaved very nobly and fairly, and to have patiently tried explanation and argument to the utmost. So that eventually, when he brought the whole matter before a full synod at Carthage (A.D. 251), peace was firmly restored, only a few fanatics breaking off into chronic schism, which gradually languished and died.

We have then here, once more, all the elements of a fairly well-managed dissension. But observe two things: First, that we are now fully within the area of the *Latin* Church, with its terrible instincts of hard centralization and over-government; while the subtlety, beauty, and freedom of the Hellenic mind are inevitably beginning to be missed. And, secondly, that these heats (as usual) produce movements toward a yet farther expansion both of force and of machinery. For we now find a very serious feature coming into view, when the

---

porary disputes about Origen's lay preaching point in the same direction. And though Cyprian's words (*Epist.* 48) may possibly be interpreted to mean no more, than that Novatus *procured* his deacon's ordination, as he certainly did the consecration of Novatian as Bishop at Rome, still no one surely could speak in the same breath of two such different crimes as breaking up the unity of the Roman Episcopate, and getting a deacon ordained without Cyprian's leave. It is in this way too that Neander understands the passage: 'Without authority from the bishop, he proceeded to *ordain* as deacon of his own Church one of his followers . . . it may have been the opinion of Novatus, on the principles of his Presbyterian system, that as a presbyter and presiding officer of the Church, he was warranted in what he had done.' (*Church History*, i. 313.)

defeated party began to look *abroad* for support against the overwhelming power at home, and first appealed for sympathy to foreign churches. We scent from afar the coming vast spiritual empire of the Roman Church. And Cyprian perhaps feels the danger too. For while he implores the Bishop at Rome not to be misled by the malcontents, but loyally to uphold the Episcopal authority across the water, he at the same time firmly protests that all such appeals to foreign Bishops are wrong, and that causes like this should be finally determined in the country where they arose [42].

It is not necessary to prolong this investigation any farther. Suffice it to say, that the second act of this great Novatian controversy at Rome, brought out still more clearly the growing habit of appealing for countenance and aid to foreign churches, and especially to the great patriarchal sees of Antioch, Alexandria, Carthage, and Rome; and thus largely contributed towards extending a well-laced organization over the whole area of the Catholic Church. While the next great dissension, (that of the Donatists,) for the first time introduced a desperate appeal to the secular power: an appeal which the confused Arian controversies, and other events, combined soon after to transfer gradually to the Bishop of Rome. So that on the revival of the Western Empire, about A.D. 800, in a Christian-barbaric form, two powers stood side by side—the Pope and the Emperor—with co-extensive domains; and the Feudal system and the Papal supremacy had begun.

And now the Church for many a long century was supreme in Europe. Her external organization was complete, and ere long had attained the highest degree of

[42] Cyp. *Epist.* 54.

efficiency. And in most countries, the secular arm was ready to do her bidding, and the sword of the state was placed at her disposal. How would she use this unexampled opportunity for good and for converting the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ? And in particular, what means would she now employ for healing the dissensions that might spring up within her magnificent empire? Would she make her vast strength an argument for patient dealing with error and schism: or (like some rude tyrant of this world) would she succumb to the fatal temptation of putting down all gainsayers by the brutal method of main force?

We all know too well the sad and disgraceful story. Even the noble-hearted St. Augustine had not been able to resist the temptation of appealing to compulsion, amid the exasperating circumstances of the Donatist controversy[43]. And now his unhappy words, 'Mali sunt prohibendi à malo, et cogendi ad bonum[44],' bore murderous and bitter fruits, such as that good man would himself have shuddered to behold. With all too fatal fidelity, the words were copied down by Gratian in his 'Decretum[45];' and so took their place among

[43] 'Allein die Waffen selbst, mit welchen man sie bestürmte, liessen, in Lehrbegriffe der herrschenden oder Catholischen Parthey, nachtheilige Wirkungen auf alle folgende Zeitalter zurück.' (Schröck, xi. 355.)

[44] 'Neminem existimas cogendum esse ad bonum! Dicis Deum dedisse liberum arbitrium, ideò non debere cogi hominem, nec ad bonum!.. Non tamen ideo qui diliguntur, malæ suæ voluntati impunè et crudeliter permittendi sunt: sed, ubi potestas datur, et a malo prohibendi, et ad bonum cogendi.' (Aug. *Epist.* 204.)

[45] Gratian, *Decretum*, part ii. cause 23:—His own conclusion is as follows: 'Rationabilitèr hæreticos persequimur; sicut et Christus corporalitèr persecutus est eos, quos de templo expulit.' (*Ibid.* 4. 37.) 'Patet, quod malos non solum flagellari, sed etiam interfici licet.' (*Ibid.* 5. 48.) The mischievous effects of these (in Richter's edition) about 25 pages of the Canon Law, are perhaps unexampled in all literature. From the date of its composition, A.D. 1151, down to the present time, they have filled the Church of the Prince of Peace with murderous feuds and bitter hatred. Nay, they have even found an

the established canons of the Western Church. By Aquinas[46] and the schoolmen they were reduced to system and maintained by argument. In the pages even of our own English Lyndwood[47] they reappeared; and lit the fires of Smithfield for the Lollards, and of Oxford for the Reformers. And when their accursed work was done, and the last flame died down in England, upon the blackened corpse of a Socinian in the market-place of Lichfield in 1612—then, within less than forty years, a ruined Church, an overthrown state, and the frantic triumph of sectarianism and anarchy proclaimed to all the world the utter failure of compulsion in religion. Men have thus been brought by slow degrees to see at last, that force and persecution were the weapons of Antichrist and not of Christ; and that charity, courtesy, and honest explanation were the only fitting weapons of a warfare which is 'not carnal, but spiritual,' and whose only lasting victories are gained by 'in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves[48].'

May this maxim, then, ever henceforth be inscribed on the Church's banners! May the thrice accursed system of compulsion be for ever abandoned and forgotten! May the blessed ancient way of peace and mutual explanation be remembered, and be the principle henceforth of every controversy in which, as church-

echo—where one would least expect it—in a refined and amiable Englishman of the nineteenth century. See Dr. Newman's *Arians*, p. 253 (1833): and *Discourses to mixed Congregations*, p. 268 (1849).

[46] Aquinas—following Augustine (c. *Lit. Petil.* ii. 83): 'Ad fidem nullus est cogendus invitus; sed per severitatem solet *perfidia* [apostacy] castigari'—draws a distinction between the Church's conduct (*α*) towards Jews and heathens: (*β*) towards her own erring children. In the first case, he forbids all compulsion: in the second, he approves even of capital punishment. (*Summa*, ii. 168.) Below, still more plainly, he says: 'hæretici, statim ex quo de hæresi convincuntur, possunt non modò excommunicari, sed et justè occidi.' (*Ibid.* xi. 3.)

[47] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, lib. v. tit. 5.

[48] 2 *Tim.* ii. 25.

men, we engage. For the battle is not to the strong or to the violent. 'The *meek* shall possess the earth.' And in this way it may even come to pass that—at some less distant period than we imagine to be likely—the well-known anticipations of De Maistre[49] may be fulfilled; and that the Church of England may, on the one side, reconcile herself to the best men and the clearest thinkers among the Protestant sects; and on the other, as the leader of the Northern and Teutonic Churches, stretch forth the hand of reconciliation to the East and to the West: and so may receive that special benediction which the Lord has reserved for the 'Peacemakers.'

[49] 'Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Eglise de l'Angleterre.' (*Considerations sur la France*, chap. ii.)

# APPENDIX A.

*List of the more important 'dissensions' within the Church; from* A.D. 30 *to the present time.*

FIRST DISSENSION (First Century): the 'Judaizing' controversy.

α. The Gnostics. | β. The Ebionites[1].

This controversy turned on the question, whether the Church was so far bound by the letter of her old Scriptures as to remain virtually a Jewish sect; or was free to incorporate the best ideas of the day,—Greek, Roman, Indian, &c.,—which were floating especially in the studious air of Alexandria. The Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 50, virtually settled the question in favour of the latter alternative: but demanded conciliatory conduct towards the Jews. Extreme parties seceded on opposite sides into Dissent.

SECOND DISSENSION (Third Century): the 'Puritan' controversy.

α. The Donatists. | β. The Montanists.

The point here was, whether purity and enthusiasm were not better marks of 'the Church of Christ' than the mere outward features of Ecclesiastical Polity. The Council of Arles, A.D. 314, virtually decided in favour of the latter theory; but without denying that Church-discipline and warmth of personal feeling were both indispensable to Christ's kingdom.

THIRD DISSENSION (Fourth Century): the 'Trinitarian' controversy.

α. The Arians. | β. The Sabellians.

The problem was, how best to retain Monotheism while accepting our Lord's miracles in the Synoptical Gospels, and the Logos-doctrine of St. John. The Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, faithfully held fast to both sides of

---

[1] The extreme tendencies marked (α) in the following list denote those of a more intellectual or '*rationalistic*' character: those marked (β) are of an imaginative or '*mystical*' type. It is hoped that this rough sketch, though not strictly accurate in detail (especially in No. VII.), may be at least suggestive of the truth in each case.

the ineffable mystery; and raised the whole question above the low levels of mere logical discussion, by pointing out that 'eternity' and 'infinity' were factors in the problem; inasmuch as He was 'begotten *from everlasting* of the Father.'

FOURTH DISSENSION (Fifth Century): the 'Free-will' controversy.

α. The Pelagians. | β. The Fatalists.

The difficulty arose as to where the line should be drawn at which human agency, in the soul's redemption, ended and divine agency began. The Church virtually decided that, in a question lying so deep among spiritual mysteries, no line could be drawn at all by human reason.

FIFTH DISSENSION (Fifth Century): the 'Incarnation' controversy.

α. The Nestorians. | β. The Eutychians.

This opened the question, how can we form any clear conception of a God-man? The Church again replied by holding fast to both sides of the mysterious truth; and combining them under the conception of a single 'personality' in Christ.

SIXTH DISSENSION (Eighth Century): the 'Iconoclastic' controversy.

α. The Iconoclasts. | β. Image-worshippers.

Christendom has now entered the dark night of Barbaric invasion. Saracenic baldness and sterility infect the Eastern Church; Gothic rudeness and ignorance deluge the Western Church. The unity of East and West sinks henceforth into abeyance; and, in default of unity, only provisional and local settlements become possible. In the West, images are restored; in the East, pictures only.

SEVENTH DISSENSION (Ninth Century): the 'Sacramental' controversy.

α. The Greeks regard them rather as 'symbols.' | β. The Latins rather as mysterious 'realities.'

Again no permanent decision was possible; and the Western Church, lacking balance from the East, fell into great superstitions.

EIGHTH DISSENSION (Eleventh Century): the 'Scholastic' controversy.

α. Nominalists. | β. Realists.

The question was one of subtle logic and word-fence; training mankind to grapple with the new facts, both in nature and history, which would ere long be presented to it. The Nominalists—following Aristotle—defined generic expressions (such as 'animal,' 'plant,' &c.) as merely mental conceptions in man; the Realists—following Plato—thought of them as true, though ideal, realities in God. The Latin Church leaned strongly towards Realism. In theology, the controversies concerning the Trinity and the Eucharist were those mainly affected by this, essentially logical, dissension.

NINTH DISSENSION (Fifteenth Century): the 'Church-reform' controversy.

α. The Puritans. | β. The Romanists.

On this question the Western Church split yet farther into pieces. The German races favoured the more prosaic and ethical view of the Church; the Latin race preferred a striking and organized unity.

TENTH DISSENSION (Nineteenth Century): the 'Church-and-State' controversy.

α. The Independents. | β. The Ultramontanes.

This is the dissension with which the Church has to deal at the present day.

# LECTURE II.

## THE INDEPENDENTS.

A.D. 1568.

*Leading Idea*:—'Purity' of the Church,—especially in its external relations.

*Method adopted*:—Dissolution of the Ecclesiastical Polity into a multitude of small republics.

*Διὰ μικρὰς καὶ τυχούσας αἰτίας, τὸ μέγα καὶ ἔνδοξον Σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τέμνοντας καὶ—ὅσον τὸ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς—ἀναιροῦντας.* (Irenaeus, iv. 53. 7.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

100. Gnostics, oppose the organized Church.
120. Marcion, especially, opposes St. John's arrangements in Asia Minor.
800. The Paulicians, in the East.
1200. The Albigenses, &c. in the West.
1400. The Lollards, Hussites, &c.
1567. Independent (Dutch Anabaptist) meeting in London dispersed.

---

1568. First regular Independent congregation in London.
1571. Robert Browne appears in public.
1584. Queen Elizabeth exasperated: five Independents suffer.
1593. Capital punishments cease: Independents banished.
1596. First Independent 'Confession,' at Amsterdam.
1603. Independent petition for Toleration, to James I.
1616. Independents return to England from Holland.
1617. Selden's Book on Tithes.
1620. Pilgrim Fathers sail for America.
1641. Independent 'Meeting,' held openly in London.
1643. Westminster Assembly (five Independents present).
1645. Church of England overthrown and proscribed.
1653. Independent 'coup d'armée'—Cromwell Protector.
1654. 'Triers' (Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists) appointed, to superintend Church patronage.
1658. An Independent 'Establishment' attempted.
1662. Ejectment of Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, from Church benefices.
— Venner's insurrection: Charles II. and James II. try to stamp out Dissent.
1672. Proposed comprehension of the Church with Presbyterians and Independents (against James II. and Romanism).
1689. Toleration Act (Romanists and Unitarians excluded).
— Proposed comprehension once more: (α) of Church, Presbyterians, Independents; (β) of Presbyterians and Independents:—both fail.
1723. George I.'s 'regium donum' to English Dissenters.
1732. 'The Dissenting Deputies' (Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists) established.
1828. Test Act repealed.
1868. Church Rates abolished.
1870. Irish Church disestablished.
1871. Attack on the English Church in Parliament defeated.

# LECTURE II.

## THE INDEPENDENTS.

'Submitting yourselves one to another, in the fear of God.'
*Ephes.* v. 21.

THE first body of Dissenters which actually broke away from the Church of England was that of the Independents, or—as they are now-a-days perhaps more intelligibly called—the Congregationalists. Their unhappy separation began in Queen Elizabeth's reign, about A.D. 1568[1]; the whole question in dispute between them and the Church being then, as it is still, essentially one of 'discipline,' or Church Polity. Discipline forms one of the three main departments, under which all Ecclesiastical affairs naturally range themselves. For if it be true that the Church is a great organized educational institution, first, it must needs have a certain external government or *discipline:* secondly, it must authorize a certain symbolism or *ritual*, to touch and enkindle men's imaginations: thirdly, it must determine, at least in outline, a certain type of *doctrine* which it shall address to their intellect.

[1] 'It is now clearly established that an Independent Church, of which Rich. Fitz was pastor, existed in 1568.' (Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 22.)

With the two latter departments, however, we shall have, in the present Lecture, nothing to do. The Independent system does not concern itself with either Ritual or Doctrine. For instance, the first rule of the Congregational Union of England and Wales[2] recognizes,—'as the distinctive principle of Congregational Churches,—the Scriptural right of every separate Church to maintain perfect independence in the government and administration of its own affairs[3].' 'The distinctive principle of Congregationalism,' says another exponent of its views, 'is that a church...is complete in itself; and that all questions of faith, discipline, and membership are to be settled by its members[4].' Hence, adds a third writer, 'practically every church is at liberty to hold *any* theological opinions, and to adopt *any* mode of worship[5].' It will, of course, be understood that in all these passages the word 'church' simply means 'congregation.' And therefore the question of polity or discipline here raised by the Independents, is one of the greatest possible importance and interest. It is nothing less than the question, whether

[2] 'In 1834, Voluntary Church associations began to be formed. The whole machinery of popular agitation was put in motion and it appeared that English Dissent was, at last, organized for the overthrow of the Church Establishment It was in the midst of this agitation that the Congregational Union of England and Wales was established... At the first annual meeting in 1833, the Declaration [of the leading Articles of their faith and discipline] was adopted.' (Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches*, p. 589.) Whatever apologies may be made for such a proceeding, no ingenuity can veil the obvious truth, that this is simply to provide *de novo*, and amid a cloud of imaginary safeguards, precisely that bond of 'union' which the Church safely provided for her people more than 1000 years ago. But then Independency was expressly invented to protest against such courses. That the safeguards *are* imaginary, let any one judge for himself, after reading 'The Rev. Brewin Grant's *Autobiography*, 1869.'

[3] *Congregational Year-Book*, 1871, p. xi.

[4] *Cyclopædia of Religious Denominations*, p. 191.

[5] *Religious Republics:* six essays on Congregationalism, 1869, p. 11.

it be not right and according to the mind of Christ, to divide the great Society or Kingdom which He left in the world into a multitude of wholly independent bodies? Whether the Unity, which all Christians agree to be a characteristic of His Church, be not a merely *ideal*, invisible and spiritual unity; instead of a visible and *organic* unity? And whether 'schism,' as Christendom had for 1500 years understood the word, be not (after all) a duty, rather than a sin,—or, at all events, only a sin when accompanied by jealous and uncharitable feelings? For 'schism,' says a Dissenting writer, 'is essentially alienation of heart between Christians,—however it may arise; manifesting itself in uncharitable, contentious conduct. This New Testament signification was given up for that of actual separation from a particular church or bishop[6].'

The true answer to these questions will, it is hoped, appear by and by. We must now occupy ourselves with an inquiry into the origin and early history of this Denomination; which, on its own political ground, has deservedly won its way to the front rank among all dissenting bodies; and which frankly inscribes upon its banner 'Dissent, for its own sake and as a principle,—not as a make-shift or a necessity[7].'

Now the cradle in which Independency was nurtured was the Non-conforming Puritanism of the sixteenth century[8]. And no one can enter one of its chapels at the

[6] *Schism* (a prize essay, 1838), p. 244.

[7] *Cyclopædia of Religious Denominations*, p. 193.

[8] Cf. Hanbury, *Memorials of Independents*, i. 6: 'Among the controversies of the age, that which the Puritans instituted concerning the office of Lay-eldership induced some.. not to halt where the larger number had agreed to rest. For the Prelatical body disdained then, as now, to permit *any* co-operation on the part of the people, in disseminating Religion by teaching; or to admit them to exercise *any* Ecclesiastical authority. [A strange inaccuracy; when we think of (1) Churchwardens: (2)

present day, without being struck with the curious fact that here we have, preserved for us through all the innumerable changes of 300 years, a specimen—complete and perfect in almost all its parts—of that very Ritual system, to impose which upon the Church of England our Puritan forefathers thought it worth while to suffer and die. A gleam of light is thus thrown on a passage of English history, which otherwise were more absolutely unintelligible and more intolerably tedious, than any other page in the 'long result of time.' And yet we must always carefully remember that Puritanism and Independency are not the same thing. The Puritan, properly so called, was nothing else than a *Presbyterian.* His one eager all-absorbing passion was, to Calvinize the Church of England. He longed to assimilate its Polity and Ritual, in all respects, to those of Scotland and Geneva. And so far from recommending 'separation,' or proclaiming 'Dissent for its own sake,' he strenuously resisted and cordially anathematized the Independents, for a whole century, on this very account; and never threw in his lot with the Dissenting interest, till he was compelled to do so by his own ejection from the Church, in 1662.

We must therefore accept with some reserve the claims advanced by modern Dissenters, as if these early Puritans belonged to their party; and as if the sufferings of such men as Cartwright and Travers had

Lay-patrons: (3) the power exercised by Parliament: (4) Lay-courts of appeal: (5) the Supremacy of the Crown: to which we must now add, (6) Lay-Synodsmen.] And the Presbyterians interpreted, on their part, the rights of the people, by admitting only *certain* of them to a kind of coordinate jurisdiction. Engrossment of power is the essence of either system . . The raising of the discussions concerning the rights of the people in Church-membership, could not but lead to the advocacy of extending the boundary of Church-authority to its extreme limit,—the *whole* Church.'

borne witness to the modern principle of 'religious equality,' or even of common 'toleration.' In point of fact, every such principle was scouted by these men, as contrary to Scripture and an insult to common sense. All they cared for was, to set up a Presbyterian Church-Establishment in this country, and to maintain it against all comers by the sword of the magistrate and the fine of the judge. 'If the question be,' says Cartwright in the sixteenth century, 'whether princes and magistrates be necessary in the Church, ... the use of them is more than of the sun, without which the world cannot stand[9].' 'I abhor,' says Baxter in the seventeenth century, 'unlimited liberty and toleration of all; and think myself able to prove the wickedness of it[10].' 'They,' says the Westminster Confession, 'who upon pretence of Christian liberty...shall maintain such erroneous opinions or practices, as are destructive to the external peace and order of the Church, may lawfully be proceeded against, by the censures of the Church and by the power of the magistrate[11].' What then, first of all, was the history and meaning of this Puritan or Presbyterian faction, which grew up in the sixteenth century within the Church of England, and from which the Independents afterwards took their rise?

I. To trace back to their springs the tiny rivulets of a gathering discontent is always a difficult task. And for a complete and thorough survey of this whole subject, we should probably have to search among the records of the earliest Norman kings; when the hierarchy first established itself in this country on the continental model,—as a separate, allied, and, ere long, rival

[9] *Reply to Whitgift* (1573), § 4.

[10] *Plain Scripture Proof*, p. 246: quoted in Neal, *Suppl.* iii. 368: and Cramp, *Baptist History*, p. 269.

[11] *Westm. Conf.* p. 65.

body beside the state[12]. Nay, it might be necessary to go still farther back; and to disinter from amid the obscurities of Anglo-Saxon times, such relics as might remain of those looser Celtic organizations[13], which were ere long superseded by the strong hand of a Theodore or a Dunstan, under the civilizing influence of the great Roman bishop who had virtually succeeded to the Cæsar's throne. For victorious as, in such cases, the party of order may at first be, there are sure to be left behind some seeds of secret dissatisfaction and a tenacious tradition of former liberty, such as no vigilance or tyranny, however unscrupulous, is ever able wholly to suppress. And when at last the restraining authority culminates and totters to its fall, the curious spectacle is often seen of reversion to the older and long latent set of ideas[14]. Reforms are then attempted. Unwisely stifled, they assume the more menacing and explosive character of a revolution. And at length, amid

[12] Previously, in Anglo-Saxon times, they had been thoroughly confused together. (Cf. Lappenberg, *History of England*, i. 192, 200 [Eng. Trans.]; Creasy, *History of the Constitution*, p. 52; Hallam, *Middle Ages*, p. 338.)

[13] See Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 186: 'At that period of the ecclesiastical history of the Celtic nations, the Episcopate was entirely in the shade. The abbots and monks alone appear to be great and influential; and the successors of Columba long retained this singular supremacy over Bishops.'

[14] The culmination of the over-organized Papal system took place about A.D. 1300, under Boniface VIII. From that moment it hastened towards its fall: and then in England, as elsewhere, many new ideas and tendencies suddenly came to light, as the strong grasp of Norman feudalism and Norman popery became relaxed. Compare Thierry, *Norman Conquest*, ii. 382: 'These acts [the enfranchisement of serfs], —very frequent in the period we have referred to [after A.D. 1381], and of which we find no instance in preceding centuries, — indicate the birth of a new public spirit opposed to the violent results of the Conquest.' And Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 457, who thus explains the failure of the Roman mission to England in the seventh century: 'Perhaps they had not understood the national character of the Anglo-Saxons; and did not know how to gain and master their minds, by reconciling their own Italian customs and ideas with the roughness, the independence, the manly energy of the populations of the German race.'

the chaos which follows, any strong man is hailed as the benefactor and saviour of his times, who can strike out some theory, erect some banner, round which men will rally once more, and for the sake of which they will consent to forego the dear, but short-lived, joys of anarchy.

Such a theorist and constitution-maker arose in the sixteenth century in France, that ever-fertile seed-plot —in all ages down to our own—of theories too logical for realization, and of paper-systems too complete to overcome in practice the friction of their own elaborate machinery. This saviour of bewildered Protestantism in the sixteenth century was John Calvin. He was a French layman, of ecclesiastical parentage and of legal education. And the tone and general character of his mind cannot be better gauged, than by the fact that at the early age of twenty-six, he drew out a finished transcript of all the opinions that he then held; and that this work, 'The Institutes of the Christian Religion,' served him, without any material alteration, to the end of a long life, as the expression of his matured judgment on all religious and ecclesiastical questions[15].

To such a man as this,—starting with the postulate which to the mind of that age seemed quite beyond dispute, viz. that in the true infallibility of the Bible was to be found the counterpoise and antidote for the false infallibility claimed by the Pope,—nothing probably seemed easier than to search for and to find, amid the pages of the inspired New Testament, a positively Divine Church-polity. The passage ultimately fixed upon was Eph. iv. 11: 'And He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers,—for the perfecting of the saints,

[15] Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, p. 34.

for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come, in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' Here Calvin persuaded himself that he had found precisely what was wanted [16]. Here lay before his eyes the long-forgotten charter of the Christian Church. Here shone out, at length, the jewel which the keen eyes of students for fifteen hundred years had overlooked; which saints and fathers and schoolmen had missed; but which suited marvellously—with a little manipulation—the very peculiar needs of Calvin's State-Church at Geneva.

For there, as in so many reforming countries at that time, no Bishop was to be had [17]. The Bishop had fled

[16] Calvin, *Instit. Christ. Relig.* iv. 3, 4: 'Qui Ecclesiæ regimini secundum Christi institutionem præsunt, nominantur à Paulo "primùm Apostoli," &c. Ex quibus duo tantùm ultimi ordinarium in Ecclesiâ munus habent: reliquos tres initio regni sui Dominus excitavit.. "Doctores" nec disciplinæ, nec sacramentorum administrationi, nec monitionibus aut exhortationibus præsunt, sed Scripturæ tantùm interpretationi. "Pastorale" verò munus hæc omnia in se continet.' Cf. Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 78. 8: 'I beseech them which have hitherto troubled the Church with questions about degrees and offices of ecclesiastical calling, because they principally ground themselves upon two places [viz. 1 Cor. xii. 28: "God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles, secondarily, prophets, thirdly, teachers, after that miracles," &c.; and Eph. iv. 11]; that, all partiality laid aside, they would sincerely weigh and examine whether they have not misinterpreted both places; and all by surmising incompatible *offices*, where nothing is meant but sundry graces, gifts, and *abilities*, which Christ bestowed.'

[17] The remarkable unanimity with which the Continental Bishops postponed every other consideration to their allegiance to the Pope, was at least intelligible, if not excusable, in the sixteenth century [see Lect. III.]. But what are we to say to a similar spectacle, which bids fair to be presented to us, in the latter half of the nineteenth century! The only explanation of such conduct is probably to be found in a circumstance to which attention was drawn by the Rev. E. Ffoulkes, at the Nottingham Church Congress, 1871: 'The keystone of the whole fabric consists in the *oath* taken by every Roman Catholic bishop at his consecration, not merely to uphold, but to augment, the privileges of his suzerain, or liege lord, by every means in his power.' This fatal oath was first imposed by Pope Gregory II. on Abp. Boniface, the English 'Apostle of Germany,' in A.D. 723. (Reichel, *See of Rome*, p. 52.)

from his post; and had left Geneva to democracy and chaos. And the lay-dictator Calvin had then, like a second Moses, rescued the community from disorder and given them a law, whose Puritan severity repressed all the symptoms of vice, without destroying it at the root. He had barred the Bishop's return; he had imposed the most stringent restraints upon the press[18], and indeed upon the private utterance of any opinion in contradiction to his own; and he had vigorously excluded all errant preachers of the Gospel, except those of his own appointment, from the pulpits of his Church[19]. And although it was unfortunate, that bishops, authors, and unattached preachers should happen to be the precise modern counterparts of 'apostles, prophets, and evangelists,' in Eph. iv. 11; and inconvenient, that there should be no mention whatever in this all-conclusive passage either of 'ruling Lay-elders,' or of a Christian Moses, or of 'Lay-deacons' charged solely with the financial business of the Church; still these difficulties could perhaps be got over by a little intrepidity. And the remark was accordingly hazarded, that the first three offices mentioned in that passage were all of a temporary character, and had died out with the Apostolic age[20]: while, for the lay-government of the Church, other texts could, no doubt, easily be found. Had not St. Paul said, 'let the elders that *rule* well be counted worthy of double honour[21]'?—it being forgotten that the verse continues, 'especially they that labour in the *word and doctrine*.' And did not the primitive Church 'look out seven men of honest report, whom we may set over this *business*[22]'? viz. of serving

[18] Dyer, p. 144.
[19] *Ibid.* p. 138.
[20] Calvin, *supra*, note 16.
[21] 1 *Tim.* v. 17.
[22] *Acts* vi. 3.

tables,—the fact being overlooked that they were thereupon immediately *ordained* with imposition of hands, and that they presently appear as 'evangelists[23],' 'preaching Christ[24]' to the people.

Thus,—even should we concede the extravagant hypothesis, that the Bible was intended to impose on mankind an infallible and unchangeable ecclesiastical polity[25], —even then, Calvin's Presbyterian scheme breaks down at all points. Confronted with Scripture, it is shown to be entirely unscriptural. Confronted with Church history it appears to be an unheard-of novelty, the offspring of one man's over-confident brain. Confronted with the ordinary facts of human life and of the world—not as they ought to be, but as they actually are—in England, within a century, it utterly broke down and disappeared: in Scotland, its adherents have split up into two or three irreconcileable fragments[26]: in Ireland, it is thought to be preparing for transformation into a moderate Episcopacy: in France, it has never succeeded in gaining one inch of ground since the great Religious wars: and in Geneva itself, it is reported to have lost all hold over a community which is, at present, almost equally divided between Socinianism and Rome.

---

[23] *Acts* xxi. 8. [24] *Ibid.* viii. 5.

[25] Dyer, 141, 142.

[26] 'The writer will never forget the sense of disenchantment with which he was struck, on actual sight of the effect [of the Free Kirk disruption] in Scotland. Two churches, where one had been; two rival communities in every parish; a sudden rent which tore the whole land asunder, and weakened and embittered both sides.' (*Blackwood's Magazine*, April, 1871, p. 454.) Surely the bitter indignation of Hume is excusable, when he exclaims: 'As much as legislators and founders of *states* ought to be honoured and respected among men, so much ought the founders of *sects* and factions to be detested and hated... Factions subvert government, render laws impotent, and beget the fiercest animosities among men of the same nation, who ought to give mutual assistance and protection to each other. And what should render the founders of parties more odious, is the difficulty of extirpating these weeds, when once they have taken root in any state. They naturally propagate themselves for many centuries.' (Hume, *Essays*, i. 71.)

And yet, amid the confusions of the sixteenth century, this impracticable system—which unites the faults and misses the advantages of both Episcopacy and Congregationalism alike—exercised a sort of fascination upon the minds of a great many good, and even able, men. In England, no doubt, Lollardism had long been secretly paving the way for its reception. For among the tenets maintained by the disciples of Wycliffe was the theory 'that Presbyters had as good right as Bishops to create new Presbyters; and indeed that every Presbyter had as much power to confer the sacraments of the Church as the Pope himself[27].' Accordingly, when the refugees who in 1539 had escaped abroad from the sharp edge of Henry the Eighth's 'six articles,' and had returned under Edward VI., found themselves driven a second time into exile under Queen Mary, the sight of Calvin's strong and tranquil 'discipline' at Geneva smote them with a kind of passionate love. Unable, as foreigners, to penetrate far below the surface of Swiss and German society[28], and forgetful of the petty scale (both as to time and space) on which the experiment had as yet been tried, they surrendered themselves to the precipitate conclusion that what was good for the little town of Geneva, with Calvin for its dictator and pope, must needs be equally good for the great realm of England, with neither dictator nor pope. And on their return to England, on the accession of Queen Elizabeth, the more

[27] Gieseler, *Church Hist.*, iv. 254.

[28] Grindal, alone among the exiles, seems to have learnt the language of the people (German) among whom he was cast. (Strype, *Grindal*, p. 13.) The rest used Latin as their means of communication. For the true state of society at Geneva, under Calvin's rigorous discipline, see Galiffe ap. Dyer, p. 153: 'To those who imagine that Calvin did nothing but good, I could produce our registers, covered with records of illegitimate children which were exposed in all parts of the town and country; hideous trials for obscenity; . . bundles of lawsuits between brothers; heaps of secret negotiations; men and women burnt for witchcraft; sentences of death in frightful numbers.'

advanced and headstrong Calvinists lost no time in broaching their opinions, and in beginning that fatal intestine conflict within the National Church, which culminated during the great Rebellion; and which issued—not, as they desired, in a Presbyterian Establishment—but in their own conquest and effacement by the 'Sectaries' whom they most vehemently resisted and abhorred[29].

It was Travers, evening lecturer at the Temple in London, and Cartwright, Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, who made themselves the chief exponents of Calvin's system for England. Both were able men; the one especially excelling as a preacher, the other as a writer. They had both been Fellows together at Trinity College, Cambridge; both had thrown themselves enthusiastically into the ultra-reforming movement which had, from quite the early part of the century, found its greatest impetus from that University; both had fallen under the lash of Whitgift, then Master of the College, afterwards Elizabeth's disciplinarian Archbishop of Canterbury; and both had visited Geneva, and witnessed there the only form of Protestant organization which had as yet been able to make head against the triple foes, whom every continental Calvinist most dreaded,—viz. the Papists, the Lutherans, and the Anabaptists.

The analogous foes whom Puritanism had to meet, and, if possible, to conquer in England were the Papists, the Anglicans, and the Sectaries. And so our own soil —which might, surely, have hoped to escape so dreadful a calamity—was henceforth, for a whole century, to be made the battle-field on which the contending French, Italian, and Dutch ecclesiastical ideas waged incessant warfare against each other and against the National Church.

[29] Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 25.

No subject probably, in all history, presents such an entangled skein for the student to unravel, as the Elizabethan re-establishment of the Church in this country. On the one hand, the European *politics* of the time formed a seething chaos; out of which emerged, a century later, at the peace of Westphalia, that approximate equilibrium called 'the balance of power.' And into the midst of that chaos England was irresistibly drawn. She was threatened by France on her front, in close alliance with Scotland on her rear[30]. Just as, on the larger continental scale, France was threatened by Germany on her front, in close union with Spain on her rear. Meanwhile, Ireland[31] formed (as usual, and whatever policy might be on foot) a distracting element in every question for England; just as Italy and the Pope have always formed a distracting complication for France. It was indeed, throughout the world, a time of travail and of teeming political confusion. The States-system of modern Europe had come to the birth. France had attained her puissant unity, the English being finally ejected from her soil. And now for some time, with her back to the Atlantic and the Pyrenees, she had been feeling for her true frontier eastward, towards Germany and Italy. Germany meanwhile, with her antiquated confederation of feudal chieftains under a nominal head, was already writhing in convulsive efforts to attain a similar unity,—granted by Providence to England, France, and Spain, but denied to her for yet 300 years to come. Spain had cast out her intrusive Arabs, and—with possessions as wide as those of England at the present day—was garrisoning the Netherlands like a fortress on the rear of France, not without a threatening aspect towards England beyond the narrow

[30] Burnet, *Reform.*, v. 325 (12mo. ed.). [31] Strype, *Grindal*, p. 206.

seas. And England, amid this rapid formation of new states on such an imposing scale, had one great wish at heart,—to secure herself hereafter from fatal diversions in her rear, by amalgamation, in some way and at almost any price, with her jealous and warlike neighbour, Scotland.

And now, on the other hand, into this seething cup of political complications was poured the additional effervescence of *religious* discord. Athwart the great rolling billows of secular confusion, came pouring the cross-seas of Protestant and Papal strife. And lastly—as the culminating misfortune for our country—the all but despotic sceptre of Henry VIII. was now grasped by the hand of a young unmarried woman of twenty-six, subject to all the ebb and flow of feminine nature, with heart drawn one way and intellect another, daily endangered by a rival and probable successor,—who was also a woman, and of opposite religion and superior personal charms to her own—and besieged by the surmises, suggestions, and despairs of a people whose memories were haunted by the horrible 'Wars of the Roses' about a disputed succession, and who had just had taste of a foreign consort upon their throne. Thus no one can deny that we have in the England of about A.D. 1560 as complicated a subject of study as the most valiant and enterprising historian could possibly desire to exercise his mind upon.

It was in the midst of all these terrible distractions, and as if quite reckless of adding tenfold bitterness and fury to the already existing strife, that the Puritans, in the year 1564, broke out into open ecclesiastical rebellion. Up to this point, it seems, things had been left in great measure to take their own course, and the inrushing streams of foreign ideas were suffered to find their own level. The only important exercise of the

Royal Supremacy which the Queen had yet ventured on, was the issue of the celebrated 'Injunctions to Clergy and Laity,' in 1559, the first year of her reign; whereby the Protestant banner was once again publicly unfurled, and all men might know that the cruel burnings and butcheries, which had made the Pope's restored dominion a loathing and a horror to Englishmen for all future generations, were—so long as she should reign—absolutely at an end. Encouraged by the news, the exiles came flocking back from Lutheran Frankfort and Strasburg [32], and from Calvinist Zurich and Geneva; bringing with them the remembrance of sad contentions even there, about the respective claims of the English Prayer-book and of Calvin's Directory for Public Worship. And it seems the Calvinist party, on returning home, at once stiffly refused to conform [33].

[32] *Orig. Letters*, p. 50; *Zurich Letters*, ii. 98; Dyer, 401.

[33] There are three instructive letters to be seen near the end of 'The Troubles at Frankfort,' 1575 (Reprint, p. 186). They form the correspondence between the three main English settlements, at Geneva, Aarau [not far from Zurich], and Frankfort, amid the delightful excitements of preparing to return home. The Genevan party begin, Dec. 15, 1559, by a circular letter to Aarau and Frankfort, thus: 'To the intent that we might show ourselves mindful of this most wonderful and undeserved grace, we thought, among other things, how we might best serve to God's glory in this work and vocation of furthering the Gospel . . wherein, no doubt, we shall find many adversaries and stays. Yet if we, whose suffrance and persecutions are certain signs of our sound doctrine, hold fast together, &c. For what can the Papist wish more, than that we should dissent one from another . . either for superfluous ceremonies or other like trifles, from the which God of His mercy hath delivered us? . . most earnestly desiring you, that we may altogether teach and practise that true knowledge of God's word, which we have learned in this our banishment, and seen in the best Reformed Churches.' This letter is signed by John Knox, Goodman, Coverdale, Whittingham, and others; all afterwards belonging to the *extreme* Puritan party. From Aarau there soon appeared a sympathizing answer: 'For the preaching and professing of sincere doctrine, so as we have seen and learned in the best Reformed Churches, we do gladly hear your advice.' This was signed by Lever, and three other *moderate* Puritans, all of whom were afterwards ordained by Grindal. From Frankfort, however, there came the following rebuff: 'To contend for ceremonies,—where it shall lie neither in your hands or

A narrow and unstatesmanlike bigotry led them, even against the advice of Bullinger and Peter Martyr and Gualter at Zurich[34]—nay, of Calvin himself at Geneva[35]—to erect some mere trifling matters of ecclesiastical ceremony and arrangement—which no human being desired to elevate into anything more than symbols of good order, and proofs of canonical obedience[36]—into matters of morbid scruple and obstinate antipathy. The innocent and comely surplice (a garment so little superstitious, that it clothes to this day,—in Rome as well as England,—choristers, sacristans, and lay-clerks) was ignorantly stigmatized as sacerdotal. A similar anathema was laid on the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage—and indeed on everything which appealed in the slightest degree to the imagination[37], and redeemed the Church's service from the dead prosaic levels of a mere Genevan pulpit-ritual. All were confounded together as 'the marks of the beast,' 'the vestments of Baal,' 'the dregs of Antichrist.' In short, grown men—like unruly boys in

ours to appoint what they shall be—it shall be to small purpose. And therefore, as we propose to submit ourselves to such orders as shall be established by authority, being not of themselves wicked,—so we would wish you willingly to do.' Signed by Pilkington, Nowell, &c., most of whom, as better *churchmen*, received promotion afterwards. Cox and others had already left Frankfort.

[34] *Zurich Letters*, i. 360, 363; ii. 39, 136.

[35] *Orig. Letters*, ii 709.

[36] 'Doth your lordship think that I care either for cap, tippet, surplice, wafer-bread, or any such? But for the *law* so established I esteem them.' (Abp. Parker to Cecil; Strype, *Parker*, ii. 424.)

[37] Nothing can better display the almost morbid want of imagination which characterized the Puritans, than their own recorded words concerning those beautiful legacies of the middle ages—the cathedrals. 'I could wish those great temples . . had been demolished from the beginning, and others more convenient for sermons and administration of the sacraments had been erected.' (Beza, *Colloq.* ii. 29.) 'As for pompous cathedrals, that serve for little but to mind us of the superstition, ostentation, and vanity of former times, and to bolster up usurping prelates in their pride and lordliness,—I have no more to say for them, but that it were well if, with the "high places," they were pulled down, and the materials thereof converted to a better use.' (*Nebustan*, 1668, p. 73.) So too Robinson, *Reply to Jos. Hall*, 1609, ap. Hanbury, i. 197.

a family—seemed determined on these points to stake the question of a successful resistance to authority. They fixed upon these as the tests, by which should be determined who was to be master. They augured from these, what were the prospects of ultimate success for 'the cause,'—in other words, for Presbyterianism,—within the Episcopal Church of England. And now,—after making their Church a laughing-stock of discord and confusion for four or five years to all Europe,—they resented, with a fierce and gloomy fanaticism, the first touch of that very ecclesiastical 'discipline,' for which (in their own sense of the word) they had so long been loudly clamouring.

It was indeed high time that something were done. For the Church of England was rapidly falling into pieces, and becoming a scandal and a weakness to the whole Protestant cause. Yet at this very moment the partisans of the Papacy were everywhere taking heart. Trent was just completing the re-organization of Neo-Romanism: France, under Charles IX., had already drawn the sword against the Huguenots: Spain, under the gloomy Philip II., was preparing her armies to crush out heresy and revolt in the Netherlands: Mary Queen of Scots was on the point of marrying Darnley, and opening the prospect of a Romanist succession to the united thrones of the two countries: and in England itself, the whole of the northern counties were already in that ferment of disquiet, which broke out shortly after in Northumberland's rebellion. Amid all these gathering indications of an impending Papal storm, what was the condition of the mainstay of Protestantism, the Church of England? It can only be described in one word; and that word is—chaos.

The centre and focus of the whole disturbance was, at this time, the University of Cambridge. There the sturdy northern self-reliant spirit of individualism had for a long time found its most congenial home. There, even so early as 1528[38], had been seen a little society of religious men, who (like the Wesleys, two hundred years later, at Oxford) encouraged each other in reading the Scriptures, in mutual confession, and similar prescribed acts of personal piety. They visited the prisoners at jails; they preached anew the vital spiritual truths—formerly enshrined, but now obscured, by the ritual and ceremonies of their Church; and were, in short, engaged in reviving religion in England under its ancient forms. The names of twenty-seven of these men have been preserved to us; and just as the early Methodists obtained the honours of ridicule and of social persecution, so the house where these first English Lutherans met was nicknamed 'Germany[39].' And worse things than ridicule were not long in following. Three members of this society had perished at the stake under Queen Mary (Bilney, Latimer, and Bradford); one had succumbed to a fever caught in visiting the sick (Stafford)[40]; and one, after being advanced to a Bishopric under Edward VI., was now under a cloud for his ultra-Puritanism (Coverdale). One only had escaped unscathed: and he now sat on the archiepiscopal throne of Canterbury (Parker).

But the return of the exiles from the continent,—bringing with them the remembrance of the bitter feuds which had split them even there into three or four different sections,—had generated a far more acrid and rebellious temper at Cambridge. And from thence the contagion had spread rapidly throughout the

[38] Strype, *Grindal*, p. 32. [39] Strype, *Parker*, i. 12.
[40] Strype, *Grindal*, p. 32.

country. About this time (1564), the students at St. John's College with one accord on the same day threw off their surplices, and in other ways took the ritual directions for divine service into their own hands[41]; and after a sermon against painted windows, the zealots committed a great destruction of them and threatened more[42]. In London a clergyman named Crowley shut some surpliced singers out of his church, and created a riot[43]. At Canterbury Cathedral, the matins and evensong were sung daily at the communion table, the minister standing behind it facing the people; while on Communion days, the table was set lengthwise, East and West, the celebrant and assistants wearing copes[44]. At Norwich Cathedral, the prebendaries not only altered the rubrics at pleasure, but had actually entered the choir and battered down the organ[45]. At Bury, the minister was about to give up his pastoral charge, rather than wear the usual college-cap,—had not his own parishioners begged him not to be so foolish[46]. And even at Court, a chaplain to Lord Leicester or one of the great men about the Queen, ventured to appear in the common layman's dress of a hat and short cloak[47]. Indeed it may be said without exaggeration, that 'systematic irreverence had intruded into the churches; carelessness and irreligion had formed an unnatural alliance with Puritanism; and in many places the altars were bare boards resting on tressels in the middle of the nave. The communicants knelt, stood, or sat as they pleased; the chalice was the first cup that came to hand; and the clergyman wore surplice, coat, black-gown, or their ordinary dress[48].'

[41] Strype, *Parker*, i. 390.
[42] *Ibid.* 382.
[43] *Ibid.* 434.
[44] *Ibid.* 365.
[45] *Ibid.* ii. 36.
[46] *Ibid.* 374.
[47] *Ibid.* 437.
[48] Froude, viii. 93 (A.D. 1564).

But it was something far more perilous than all this, that nobody even yet believed in the stability of the new order of things, or in the firmness of the Queen's intentions regarding Protestantism. Five years had elapsed, and she still, against the remonstrances of her Bishops, retained the crucifix and lighted tapers in her private chapel[49]. She was known to have sent official notice of her accession to the Pope. And though she had allowed a most scandalous public burning of roods, service-books, and figures of saints in Cheapside and other places, during Bartholomew fair, 1559[50],—yet her Court favourites (Leicester especially) were allowed to protect Papists[51], as well as to countenance every other person who could give annoyance and trouble to the Bishops; while a scandalous pillage of Church goods and Church endowments was allowed to go on unrestrained, under her very eyes. Who can be surprised then, that 'now once more had come a reaction, like that which had welcomed Mary Tudor to the throne;' that 'in quiet English homes there arose a passionate craving to be rid of all these things; to breathe again the old air of reverence and piety;' and that 'Calvinism and profanity were, like twin spirits of evil, making a road for another Mary to reach the English throne[52].'

It was to meet this very real danger that Elizabeth at last aroused herself; and in 1565 compelled her Bishops,—much against their will,—to declare that open war upon Puritan non-conformity, whose results, both for good and evil, have lasted down to our own day. In the August of the preceding year the spring was touched, which let loose all the elements of destruction. The Queen had made a progress to Cambridge. And for

[49] Strype, *Parker*, i. 92.
[50] Strype, *Grindal*, 37.
[51] *Ibid.* 113.
[52] Froude, viii. 93.

four days,—owing to precautions which almost remind one of the Empress Catherine's journey amid pasteboard villages and scenic prosperity in Southern Russia,—the shocking disorders of its long-standing Puritanism were concealed from her view. On the fifth day all was unintentionally revealed. A blasphemous pageant, in which a dog appeared carrying the Eucharist in its mouth, shocked and horrified the Queen beyond measure. She rose and hastily left the room. And she, no doubt, determined from that moment that duty both to God and man demanded of her a conscientious exercise of her visitatorial powers[53] as 'supreme governor' in all departments of the State; and resolved that her vacillation should no longer betray the Reformed Church of England to its ruin.

In the following January, therefore (1565), she despatched a sharp letter to Archbishop Parker, severely rebuking him and the other Bishops for their remissness. There were differences of opinion,—she said,—differences of practice, differences in the rites used in her Churches, throughout the realm. 'We thought, until this present, that by the regard which you, being the Primate and Metropolitan, would have had hereto, . . these errors,

[53] No great revolutions, either in Church or State, can possibly be accomplished without some mistakes and temporary confusions. But that this, and no more than this, is the true meaning of the 'royal supremacy,' appears abundantly both from Queen Elizabeth's words and acts. E.g. in the very first year of her reign we have (1) an 'Admonition to simple men, deceived by malicious:—Her Majesty neither hath, nor ever will, challenge any other authority, than that . . which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms . . so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them:' (ap. Lingard, vi. 325;) (2) a commission issued to certain persons to visit,—like Charlemagne's 'Missi,'—the northern counties; 'quoniam utrumque Regni nostri statum, tam Ecclesiasticum quam Laicum, *visitare* . . constituimus,' (ap. Burnet, iv. 417.)

tending to breed some schism or deformity in the Church, should have been stayed and appeased. But perceiving very lately, and also certainly, that the same doth rather begin to increase than to stay or diminish, we—considering the authority given us of Almighty God for defence of the public peace,—mean not to endure or suffer any longer these evils thus to proceed: . . that our people may thereby quietly honour and serve Almighty God in truth, concord, peace, and quietness; and thereby also avoid the slanders that are spread abroad hereupon in foreign countries[54].'

But neither in Church nor State, neither in the military, the scholastic, nor any other profession, can discipline be thus sharply and suddenly braced up, after a long period of relaxation and confusion, without serious sacrifices and losses. And in the present instance, the first sacrifice which the Queen's abruptness demanded was that of the peace, the reputation, the pastoral influence, the personal feelings, and all but of the conscience, of the bishops. Archbishop Parker implored Cecil 'not to strain the cord too tightly;' and if he must act, requested an express letter from the Queen as his authority for enforcing her commands. 'Neither a letter from herself however, nor assistance in any form from the government would Elizabeth allow to be given. The bishops should deliver their tale of bricks, but they should have no straw to burn them . . . Never were human beings in a more cruel position. Elizabeth sat still in malicious enjoyment of the torture which she was inflicting. The Archbishop warned Cecil of the inevitable consequences . . and, driven as he was against his will to these unwise extremities, he again

[54] Strype, *Life of Parker*, iii. 67.

entreated that some member of the Council might be joined in commission with him. On this last point Elizabeth would yield nothing[55].' What wonder that Parker should write about this time [1566], 'Can it be thought that I alone, having sun and moon against me, can compass this difficulty? . . I shall not report how I am used of many men's hands. I commit all to God. If I die in the cause (malice so far prevailing), I shall commit my soul to God in a good conscience[56].' What wonder that he should again and again warn the government 'in hac causâ ne nimium tendas funiculum[57]:' or that he should, —like Hooker, a few years later—foresee, 'how secure soever the nobility [Leicester, Sir F. Knollys, &c.] were of the Puritans, and countenanced them against the bishops, . . all that these men tended towards was to the overthrow of all of an honourable quality and the setting afoot of a Commonwealth[58].' And yet it is of this man,—a kind-hearted, loyal, and courageous Englishman, an orderly and law-abiding man, a lover of books and of peaceful studies[59], an earnest remonstrant against all harsh measures, and a Protestant from his early youth (æt. 16 or 17) at Cambridge[60],—that a partisan historian writes, 'Parker had seceded from Rome, and retained the ferocity of an Inquisitor[61]:' and another, out-Heroding Herod, ventures to add that he was 'a hot-headed, intolerant, arbitrary and vindictive man . . He shocked the statesmen of his age and at last shocked Elizabeth herself. Not being an ecclesiastic, there was a limit to her capacity for creating and afterwards enjoying the sight of human suffering. There was no such limit

[55] Froude, viii. 134.
[56] Strype, *Parker*, ii. 453.
[57] *Ibid.* i. 322.
[58] *Ibid.* ii. 323: cf. Hooker, iv. 8, 4.
[59] *Ibid. passim.*
[60] *Ibid.*
[61] Fletcher, *Hist. of Independency*, ii. 100.

in Parker. The jackal's appetite was for once stronger even than that of the lioness[62].'

Unhappily, language of this unpardonable kind has, from the very beginning, disgraced the Puritan cause. In praise of its own system and its own partisans, no encomiums could ever soar too high. 'It claimed a higher Scriptural authority for Presbyterianism,' says a Wesleyan writer, 'than its Episcopal antagonists asserted for prelacy itself[63].' Its adherents were always 'the godly,' 'the elect,' 'the truly religious,' 'God's dear children.' But in describing its adversaries, however conscientious they might be, no words could be too scurrilous, no abuse too shocking. So that even Archbishop Grindal,—himself a Puritan,—'when at length he saw that no other means would bring them to obedience, approved of restraint, especially of the heads of the faction, whom he styled "fanatical and incurable[64]."' Even Bullinger,—the Calvinist pastor at Zurich, to whom they themselves were constantly appealing—writes in 1567 to Beza, (Calvin's successor at Geneva), 'Sampson never wrote a letter without filling it with grievances, the man is never satisfied . . . when he was here, I used to get rid of him in a friendly way, as well knowing him to be a man of a captious and unquiet disposition. England has many characters of this sort, who cannot be at rest and can never be satisfied[65].' Again, five months later, he writes: 'It certainly appears from the conversation of

[62] Skeats, *History of Free Churches of England*, p. 14. It is impossible not to suspect that this writer,—who supports the above statement by a solitary reference to a letter in Strype which he misunderstands, and who [p. 15, second edit.] makes Cartwright an Oxford man,—has here confounded together the characters of Parker and Whitgift.

[63] Stevens, *History of Methodism*, i. 21.

[64] Strype, *Grindal*, p. 448.

[65] *Zurich Letters*, ii. 152. Sampson was a Puritan Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

these men that their minds are entirely set against the Bishops; for they can scarcely say anything respecting them but what is painted in the blackest colours, and savours of an *odium Vatinianum*[66].'

Such being the temper of the English Puritans, as attested by their own firmest friends and co-religionists, we cannot be surprised that Elizabeth's first attempt, in 1565, to tighten the reins of ecclesiastical discipline was met with a storm of abuse and resistance. The Puritans looked round in all quarters indiscriminately for help and support. They appealed to the foreigner: they appealed to the Parliament: they appealed to their friends in the Queen's Council: they appealed to the common law courts. One thing alone seems never to have struck them: viz. the simple duty of obedience to their Church in trifles, and the good policy of presenting an unbroken front to the common enemy, Popery,—which was watching to destroy them all[67]. Such duties, even when inculcated repeatedly by the foreigners to whom they appealed, were repudiated with scorn. In fact, the difference between the Anglicans and the Puritans at this time, narrow as it may seem, was as deep as it was narrow. The former obeyed in trifles, because they recognized the *right* of ecclesiastical authority to command in all things left open by God; the latter rebelled in trifles, because they recognized *no right* in any mortal

[66] *Zurich Letters*, ii. 155. Vatinius was a person celebrated in Cicero's time for his scurrility and abusiveness.

[67] There is good reason to believe that some of those who appeared at this time to be the most violent Puritans, were really Jesuits in disguise. In 1569, one Heath, a Jesuit, was summoned before the Bishop of Rochester; and on him was found a letter in which Hollingham, Coleman and Benson are mentioned, as persons employed to sow faction among the heretics. Yet these three persons are unsuspectingly described by Fuller, *Church History*, ix. 81: by Heylin, *Hist. Presbyt.* xvi. 257: and by Camden, *Annals*, 1568, as violent Puritans. (Cf. Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Schism*, p. xiii.)

man to impose anything in religion, which God had not expressly commanded[68]. The tendency of the Anglicans, therefore, at this time, was to join the German Reformers; who found their temporary fulcrum of resistance to the Papacy in the civil power, while they appealed in the long run to a future Ecclesiastical Council. The tendency of the Puritans, on the other hand, was to ally themselves closely with the French and Swiss Calvinists; and with them to make their sole appeal to Scripture, as interpreted by each man's individual reason and conscience. The one system based itself on men's duties: the other, on men's rights. Yet the one, which looked at first sight more like servitude, has been proved to favour liberty; for it has swung freely to an anchor placed in the far future. It has ever looked forward to a prospective re-arrangement of the Church's affairs by a Council, wherein the voice of other people's opinions would have to be heard, and where the standing and traditional precedents of Christendom should form the acknowledged common ground for a mutual agreement. The other, or French system,—though looking at first more like liberty,—has been found in practice to favour mental servitude. For the

[68] This extravagant assertion of the rights of the individual conscience must, if allowed, render all government—whether civil or religious—impossible. An infallible Pope claims to judge, without appeal, what matters fall within the area of his infallibility. And an infallible 'conscience' must needs do the same. Why then should not a Quaker plead conscience against paying taxes for the support of the army? Why should a 'conscientious objector' to the late Education Act have distraint put upon his goods? Where shall we stop? Yet this thoughtless claim appears to be urged still, without any limitations, in certain circles. 'The question at issue really was, whether conscience—be it well or ill informed—must submit to the authority of men, or be subject to the authority of God only . . . For this conduct, instead of being reproached as narrow-minded and bigoted sectarians, who involved the nation in blood and mischief for trifles, they deserve to be had in everlasting remembrance, as sufferers for pure and undefiled religion.' (Orme, *Life of Baxter*, 1830, p. 192.)

obedience claimed for the mere letter of a book, becomes ere long inevitably transferred to the interpreters of that book; and the despotism of a Pope,—who may at least die and be changed for another and a better man,—is simply replaced by the despotism of an oligarchy whose watchful dogmatism never dies; whose antiquated traditions soon come to be held up to veneration as 'the truth;' and whose tyranny leaves open no way of escape, or of thinking and breathing freely, as a Christian ought to do, except one way—and that is the way of secession, the principle of an absolute individualism, the method of Congregational or even personal Independency.

And that way the Englishmen of the sixteenth century, confused and deafened by the noisy clamour of a Puritanism which could never make up its mind either to conform or to secede, were not long in finding out. And in finding it, no one surely can deny that the Independents,—however terribly mistaken they may be in their first principles of ecclesiastical action and in pushing the idea of men's 'Rights' to an absolutely revolutionary extreme,—at least found their way out into the open daylight of honesty and common sense. For if the Independent refuses to conform, secedes from the Church, and then fights a long and vigorous battle for complete political and social toleration,—barring the first false step,—he is a man worthy of all respect and honour. The complete toleration he valiantly demands, he has a perfect political right to attain. Nor will he fail, in the course of its attainment, to teach his country, and even the Church which he has left, some valuable lessons of liberty; until the time shall come that he will learn from her, in his turn, the inestimable value of Christian obedience, and the invincible strength gained

by ecclesiastical cohesion; and shall see how far grander and more Christ-like a thing it is to bend one's will to public Duty, than to stand stiffly and jealously upon one's private Rights[69].

We have reached then the point at which Independency broke off from its parent, Presbyterian nonconformity. And the farther history of Presbyterianism within the Church of England may now be very briefly told. Foiled at all points, during the later years of Queen Elizabeth, by the indefatigable ability and determination of Archbishop Whitgift, and passing restlessly (as is the wont of a weaker party) from one subject and method of controversy to another[70], they naturally looked forward, with hopes raised to the highest pitch of excitement, to the day, now rapidly approaching, which should place a Scotch Presbyterian prince upon the united throne of both kingdoms. And in fact, James I. had hardly crossed the border in 1603, ere he was encountered by a deputation of grave Puritans, bringing with them the so-called Millenary petition, signed by 800 non-conforming 'Ministers of the Church of England.' They had, however, much miscalculated the effect which a long and near acquaintance with Presbyterianism had produced upon that shrewd king's mind. And instead of an intention to assimilate the

[69] This lesson is inculcated not only by the text which stands at the head of this Lecture, but by a hundred other passages of Holy Scripture. I cannot forbear, however, pointing out one noble, profound, and deeply touching appeal in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, which ought to put all 'dissent for dissenting's sake' to crimson shame and confusion of face. It is the passage, Phil. ii. 1–14: . . 'let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus,' . .

[70] Cf. Tertullian's description of the Dissenters in his own time: 'à regulis suis variant inter se; dum unusquisque proinde suo arbitrio modulatur quæ accepit . . . Penitùs inspectæ, hæreses omnes in multis cum auctoribus suis dissentientes deprehenduntur.' (*De Præscr. Hær.* § 42.)

English Church to that of Scotland, they soon found reason to suspect, in this Scottish dynasty, a fixed purpose to reform the Northern Church itself after the Southern model. And henceforth,—although the political struggle against despotism was begun (it is true) by Churchmen, and the Long Parliament of 1640 was Episcopalian almost to a man[71],—bitterness and tenacity were added to the civil strife by the whole force of Ecclesiastical Puritanism being thrown into the ranks of the opposition. Till at last, in 1646 a Presbyterian army held Charles I. prisoner; a Presbyterian House of Commons ruled the country; a Presbyterian assembly sat supreme at Westminster; and—within one hair's breadth—a Presbyterian Church was established and endowed in this country, and the long-desired union with 'the best reformed Churches on the continent' was all but completed. But by that hair's breadth we were saved. And, through the agency of the Independents, a calamity was averted which, in all human probability, would long before this time have cast back the majority of the English people into the arms of Rome. Ere twenty years were past, the Presbyterians were themselves ejected, together with all the promiscuous crowd of Dissenters who had occupied the parsonages and parish churches throughout England[72]. And

[71] Skeats, p. 49.

[72] This ejectment of 1662, of which so much has been made, was simply one in a *series* of similar events. For religious quarrels (unchecked by good sense) have always taken the same course, whether on the large European scale or on the small one of a single country—or even parish. First comes a preliminary skirmish with literary weapons; and then follows a miserable warfare of persecutions, ejectments, and a merciless wielding of all social, legal, and even physical methods of offence. Thus, in the twenty years preceding 1662, we have in 1641, the 'Protestation' imposed upon all Englishmen, against Charles I. by the *Churchmen* of the Long Parliament: in 1643, the 'solemn League and Covenant' imposed upon the whole nation, by the *Presbyterians:* in 1649, the 'Engagement'—an

we may now leave these non-conforming Presbyterian officers of an Episcopalian Church, and pass over to the history of those more sturdy and honest Englishmen, of uncompromising Calvinist opinions, who—conscious that the Church was not really Calvinist, and that to make her so was simply an impossibility—took at once the only manly course open to them, viz. that of secession from her ranks.

II. The first person who ventured openly to take this decisive step was the Rev. Robert Browne. He was a Cambridge man, regularly ordained, and now (about 1570) was keeping a school in Southwark. He felt, no doubt, emboldened by having a powerful friend at court, no less a person than Lord Burleigh, his kinsman and the Queen's great adviser, especially in ecclesiastical affairs. He was an able, though a turbulent and impracticable person. His books and pamphlets formed for a long time the arsenal, whence the controversial weapons of his party were procured[73]: and he is acknowledged by

---

oath to maintain the existing state of things, viz. a government by Parliament without either King or Lords,—imposed on all England by the *Independents*. If any minister refused it, he was instantly deprived; and many of the Presbyterian clergy suffered accordingly, —Reynolds, among the rest, being deprived of his deanery of Christ Church. (Cf. Carwithen, *Church History*, ii. 127, &c.). As to the number of Nonconformists who were really ejected in 1662, Dissenting writers appear to have been guilty of the most incredible exaggerations. A careful examination has lately been made of Calamy's list, on which the whole of the 'bicentenary' rhetoric was founded. It turns out that his History is, for all statistical purposes, absolutely worthless. In London, e.g., he represents the ejectments as amounting to 293: the truth being that, on the highest possible computation, they only amount to 127. In Essex, more than half the cases which stand upon his roll were not true cases of ejectment. In Hertfordshire, four-fifths of his list disappear under investigation. In short, there is every reason to believe that unbiassed inquiry would strike off from the celebrated catalogue of '2000 confessors' no less than 1200 names.

[73] 'He deserveth to have the honour, if any be; and to be called the Captain and master of them all. They have all their furniture from him: they do but open his pack, and display his wares: they have

the latest Independent historians to have held all the views which distinguish the denomination at this moment, with one important exception,—viz. that he had no idea of what we now mean by '*toleration*.'

This exception, however, is (as it happens) of the greatest possible interest to us. For it is just this question of toleration—or, as it has now come to be worded, 'religious equality,'—which has grown in our own days to be the grand battle-flag of the whole Independent body. And endless are the appeals to our indignation, to our pity, to our admiration, in behalf of a denomination which we are led to suppose has from the earliest times, loyally and amid innumerable sufferings, preached that doctrine which the superior wisdom of the present age now at last recognizes as the truth[74]. And yet, here we are met, at the very outset of their history, with the startling fact that the founder himself—and not only the founder, but all the earliest champions and martyrs of Independency—as earnestly repudiated 'toleration,' as the Churchmen and Presbyterians, and perhaps every human being at that period, repudiated it. Yes: intolerance formed part of the very atmosphere of those times; and no one—not Luther or Calvin or Cranmer or Cartwright[75]—could escape its subtle infection. The

---

not a sharp arrow, which is not drawn out of his quiver.' (Giffard, *Short Treatise against the Brownists*, 1590: preface, ap. Hanbury, i. 50.)

[74] Hume credits *no* 'denomination,'—if left to itself,—with the virtue of toleration. He says: 'If, among Christians, the English and Dutch have embraced the principles of toleration, this singularity has proceeded from the steady resolution of the *civil magistrate*.' (*Essays*, ii. 438.)

[75] Luther invoked the civil sword against the Anabaptists: Calvin burnt Servetus: Cranmer burnt Jane Bouchier: and of Cartwright, a Dissenting writer says, 'Parker and Whitgift persecuted the Puritans; but if Cartwright had been in Whitgift's place, he would have dealt out equal persecution to Baptists and Independents. (Skeats, p. 20.)

Independents, when they had the power (as they shortly afterwards had in America), would be sure to persecute their opponents as fiercely and unrighteously as they themselves had been persecuted. And, in short, what Cromwell a hundred years later bitterly complained of, was in these earlier Elizabethan days still more conspicuously true: viz. that each sect cried out lustily for liberty and toleration; and when they had acquired it, would by no means allow it to any but themselves[76]. We may therefore waive and put aside—not without some impatience—the long and lamentable threnodes, the modern 'lives of the saints' and 'acts of the martyrs,' which form the staple of so many Dissenting histories,—especially since the so-called Bicentenary movement, in 1862. Such narratives are stimulating to devotion; they are useful in polemics; they inflame the passions; they check the suggestions of brotherly-kindness and moderation. But no man of sense lingers now amid these sickening scenes. He cares not to know *what* good people suffered in bygone times: but rather *why* they suffered, what was the cause they really died for, and what were the historical circumstances of their time which led to so sad—although perhaps inevitable—a struggle[77].

Returning then to Robert Browne and the Inde-

[76] Carlyle, *Cromwell*, ii. 298: 'That hath been one of the vanities of our contest. Every sect saith, "O give me liberty." But give it to him, and to his power he will not yield it to anybody else.'

[77] The multiplication of endless and meaningless Martyrologies creates the same impatience in a modern student of Church history, as the old-fashioned records of interminable dynastic conflicts creates in the student of secular history. 'By and by,' writes Mr. Huxley, with his usual good sense, 'we must have history,—treated not as a succession of battles and dynasties, not as a series of biographies, not as evidence that Providence has always been on the side of either Whigs or Tories,—but as the development of man in times past, and other conditions than our own.' (*Lay Sermons*, &c., p. 59.)

pendents,—their subsequent history may now be briefly narrated. It was, as we have seen, about the year 1570 that this hot-headed man thought fit to add to the other difficulties and distractions of his country, in her death-struggle against Popery, by loudly summoning every Puritan who would listen to him, to break up the National Church without any scruple, and to pulverize into a heap of incoherent fragments the only organized means of ecclesiastical resistance the country possessed. Yet at this very moment, the signal-gun was being charged at Rome, which was to let loose, if possible, upon our fair land all the horrors of domestic rebellion and of foreign invasion. In 1569 the Pope and his conclave drew up, and in 1571 they launched into the country, one of those shameful clerical proclamations which Englishmen can never forget and never can or ought to forgive. By this Bull, Pope Pius V. declared Elizabeth a heretic and a favourer of heretics; released her Lords and Commons and all others from their oaths of obedience; and forbade, under pain of Anathema, any one to obey her laws[78].

Who can wonder that, at such a juncture as this, the foolish and mischievous preacher of confusion and religious separation—none the less mischievous because conscientiously and religiously so—was summoned before the Queen's Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and bidden to hold his peace? On this, he at once departed for Holland. For it was under Dutch Anabaptist influence, which was strong in the Eastern counties, that he had learnt his new ideas: and that country, having lately emancipated itself from the dreadful tyranny of Spain, offered free scope for every sort of ecclesiastical

[78] See the document, given in full by Burnet, *Reformation*, iv. 452.

experiment, and for the full enjoyment of that, which seems perhaps to most men, before experience, the most delightful of all things,—viz. perfect Independence, entire liberation from the vexatious restraints of Law, absolute freedom to do whatsoever they will.

But alas, when men obtain, at length, this long-coveted prize, when that most delightful thing is reached, that golden fruit is grasped—the power to do exactly as one likes—what bitter disappointments immediately arise! The glittering fruit turns to ashes in the hand. The truth of the adage is at last recognized, 'how much better is the half than the whole.' And the sad discovery is made,—perhaps too late to be of any real use,—that laws mean nothing more, after all, either in Church or State, than a system of mutual insurance for each man's personal liberty; and that (in the German poet's words) obedience to them alone 'can give any man true Freedom[79].'

Browne had hardly set up his separatist communion in Holland, ere (as the Independent historian confesses[80]) 'dissensions quickly sprang up, and their pastor retreated into Scotland,'—at that time a congenial scene of religious discord and confusion. 'Yet even here,' adds the same writer, 'he was so great a malcontent, that he was committed to ward, and detained a night or two in prison.' The next year (1585) finds him once more in England. And the protection of his powerful kinsman, Lord Burleigh, enabled him to publish, with impunity, several tracts and books,—the title of one being suggestive of the contents of all: viz. 'On Reformation without tarrying for any.' At last, in

[79] *Nur das Gesetz kann uns die Freiheit geben.* (Goethe.)

[80] Hanbury, *Memorials of the Independents*, i. 22.

Northampton his rude and turbulent conduct became so unbearable, that he was solemnly excommunicated by the Bishop of the diocese. And then this violent and undisciplined soul was actually melted into submission. He made his peace with the Church; and ere long was presented to a living, where he died in obscurity, at an advanced age, in 1630,—leaving (says a Dissenting author, with a curious cynicism) 'to the Church of England the ample legacy of his shame. All that was discreditable in him, Independents remit to his ultimate patrons; the good alone that has followed his career, they shrink not from applauding and adopting[81].'

But now arose a succession of storms, conspiracies, rebellions, confusions, in our country, which as Elizabeth grew older could hardly fail to have their effect in hardening and embittering her character. Plots were everywhere exploding beneath her feet. A murderess, an adulteress, and a Papist, was the presumptive successor to her throne. Terror-stricken fugitives from continental massacres were crowding her dominions. And the white sails of the Armada seemed already to be towering in her narrow seas. Who can wonder at her righteous indignation, who can seriously blame her impatience, at the Puritans and Brownists, who—with their incredible puerilities about cap and ring and surplice and tippet—were sedulously and conscientiously labouring to undermine the foundations on which her house, and theirs, was built? Hence it came to pass that,—not by the Church, but by the State,—in the ten years between 1583 and 1593, five Independents (and, be it remembered, five only) were hanged, for what then

[81] Hanbury, i. 24.

appeared to the Judges, the Parliament, the Statesmen of England, to be seditious and inflammatory language. 'By law we proceed against all offenders,'—write certain Puritan justices of the peace and magistrates from Suffolk, in 1583,—'we touch none that the law spareth, and spare none that the law toucheth. We allow not . . of the Anabaptists and their communion: we allow not of Brown, the overthrower of Church and Commonwealth: we abhor all these, we punish all these. And yet we are christened with the odious name of Puritans[82].'

'If any person,' says Parliament in 1581, 'shall devise, write, print, or set forth any book, rhyme, ballad, letter, or writing, containing any false, slanderous and seditious matter to the defamation of the Queen or to the stirring or moving of any rebellion . . every such offence shall be adjudged felony[83].' It was when sent for trial by such magistrates, and under such Acts of Parliament as these, that the Law Courts of the realm found these men guilty. And of these convictions, no less a layman than Lord Bacon thus delivers his opinion, in 1592: 'As for those whom we call Brownists, . . . a very small number of very silly and base people, here and there in corners dispersed, they are now (thanks be to God!) by the good remedies that have been used, suppressed and worn out: so as there is scarce any news of them[84].' And in the same year, Sir Walter Raleigh thus expressed himself in Parliament: 'In my conceit, the Brownists are worthy to be rooted out of the Commonwealth[85].'

And yet,—will it be believed?—the deaths of these men are perpetually laid to the charge of the Bishops,

[82] Strype, *Annals*, iii. 103; Neal, *Puritans*, i. 254.
[83] *Statutes of the Realm*, vi. 336.
[84] *Works*, ii. 35: ap. Hanbury, i. 35.
[85] Hanbury, i. 34.

and attributed to the intolerance of the Church of England. They were 'sacrificed by a blood-guilty Protestant hierarchy[86]:' 'Thus fell these unhappy gentlemen to the resentment of an angry prelate[87]:' 'The ferocity of Archbishop Parker was even exceeded by that of Whitgift . . . His throne was the chair of pestilence; his mouth full of cursing against God and his saints[88].'

And now, who were these five men? and what were their delinquencies? The two first that suffered were Thacker and Copping, condemned, in 1583, for spreading Browne's books, and for saying the Queen was perjured. 'They were both sound,' says the Puritan historian, 'in the doctrinal articles of the Church of England, and of unblemished lives. One Wilsford, a layman, should have suffered with them: but on conference with Secretary Wilson, who told him the Queen's supremacy might be understood only of her Majesty's *civil* power over ecclesiastical persons, he took the oath, and was discharged[89].' Thus easy was it to escape 'persecution' by a little common sense, and by listening to reason. The three others who suffered death were Barrowe, Greenwood, and John Penry, a Welsh clergyman. These all fell victims in 1593, not to the Archbishop's anger, but to the indignation of the Queen and the whole country at the appearance of the scurrilous and

[86] Hanbury, i. 63.

[87] Neal, i. 356.

[88] Fletcher, *Hist. of Independency*, ii. 143. It is quite a relief to contrast with the violence of these party writers the calm reasonableness of men like Dr. Stoughton and Dr. Robert Vaughan. 'In the sixteenth century,' says the former, 'and far into the seventeenth, intolerance, inherited from former ages, infected more or less all religious parties.' (*The Church of the Civil Wars*, i. 17.) 'The Queen,' writes the latter, 'was not a little displeased. The Bishops [in 1565] had been disposed to a more liberal course.' (*Engl. Nonconformists*, p. 54.)

[89] Neal, i. 256.

blasphemous Mar-prelate tracts, in 1588. It is impossible to give any extracts from these abominable and filthy lampoons. The judgment of a contemporary Puritan writer shall suffice. 'Three most grievous accidents did greatly astonish us, and very much darken the righteousness of our cause. The first was a foolish jester, who called himself Martin Mar-prelate and his sons; which, under counterfeit and apish scoffing, did play the sycophant and slanderously abused many persons of reverend place and note. This kindled a marvellous great fire. Then did our troubles increase[90].'

Now it was under the impression—though perhaps an erroneous one—that Penry was the author of some of these inflammatory papers, that the Privy Council issued an order for his apprehension in 1590. He escaped for the time into Scotland. But, three years later, he had the incredible rashness to return to London, for the purpose of presenting an Address to the Queen; the draft of which, found on his person, contained the following expressions: 'Madam! you are not so much an adversary to us poor men, as unto Jesus Christ and the wealth of His Kingdom . . . This peace, under these conditions, we cannot enjoy: and therefore, for anything I can see, Queen Mary's days will be set up again, or we must needs temporize . . . When any are called before your Council, or the Judges of the land, they will not stick to say that they come not to consult whether the matter be with or against the *Word* or not: but their purpose is to take the penalty of the transgressions against your *laws*[91].' Now this is just what the Judges of the land—with the full concurrence of Noncon-

[90] Nicholls, *Plea for the Innocent* (1602), p. 33: ap. Hanbury, i. 5.
[91] Neal, i. 357.

formists and all men of sense—say at the present day. Indeed, is not this precisely one great part of what we mean now-a-days by 'religious toleration;' viz. that the officers of the State shall *not* be empowered to impose on men their own interpretations of the 'Word,' but shall act merely as civilians and administrators of the laws? Such, however, was not at all the mind of Penry and the Independents of those days. 'Her Majesty,' says he, 'hath full authority from the Lord, by her *royal power* to establish and enact all laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, among her subjects[92].' 'We acknowledge,' write Barrowe and Greenwood together in 1591, 'that the prince ought to *compel* all his subjects to the hearing of God's Word in the public exercises of the Church[93].' And yet this same Barrowe is panegyrized by modern Independents, as 'one of the most remarkable men that have ever engaged in religious controversy in the worst of times[94].' Greenwood is called 'another instance of resistance to oppression by a courageous and enlightened mind[95].' Penry is said to have been 'of great service by his talents, zeal, and Christian discretion, to the cause which he espoused[96].'

What, then, was that cause? For what was it—in the name of common sense—that these men contested and suffered? It was not (as we have seen) for the great principles of Independency, as expounded by modern writers. It was for nothing in the world but for the mere 'crotchet,' that the State was bound at the

[92] *Declaration of Allegiance:* ap. Hanbury, i. 79.

[93] *Plain Refutation*, p. 4: ap. Fletcher, ii. 166. Well may this writer add: 'The principles of civil and religious liberty had not then been investigated and acknowledged, as in later times.'

[94] Hanbury, i. 61.

[95] *Ibid.* p. 63.

[96] Fletcher, ii. 206.

sword's point to establish Calvin's *divine* Church-system (drawn from Ephesians iv. 11) on the ruins of the existing *human* one[97]. It was for the 'fixed idea,' that the Queen and the government, in resisting this interpretation of the infallible Word of God, were resisting the Holy Spirit Himself, and going to perdition. It was for the insane fanaticism, which led them to urge the overthrow of the ecclesiastical constitution of their country in language so violent and inflammatory[98], that no court of justice, in such dangerous times as those were, could possibly forbear to put the Act of Parliament into execution. No question, then, of the slightest importance to any human being was here at issue. No subtle and far-reaching doctrine was under dispute. No blow for liberty was here being struck; nor any single step of intellectual or moral progress being gained. Whether

[97] 'The Queen is governor of the whole land, . . but may not make any other laws for the Church of Christ, than He hath left in His Word. I cannot see it lawful for any prince to alter the least part of the judicial law of Moses.' (*Barrowe*, ap. Hanbury, i. 38.) 'Every congregation of Christ ought to be governed by that presbytery which Christ appointed; a pastor, teacher, and elder.' (*Greenwood*, ap. Hanbury, i. 63.) 'I have, by public writing, laboured to defend and induce in our Church that uniform order of Church-regiment, which our Saviour Christ hath ordained in His Word to continue perpetually therein; and also, have endeavoured to seek the utter ruin and overthrow of that wicked hierarchy of Lord Bishops.' (*Penry*, ap. Hanbury, i. 74.)

[98] 'Each of these men attack, with the most extraordinary fury, (1) the *Episcopalian* Churchmen,—with their "old, written, rotten stuff .. abstracted out of the Pope's blasphemous Mass-book;" their "stinking patchery devised apocrypha liturgy;" their "false ecclesiastical regiment, the Kingdom of the Beast;" "blasphemous wretches, who give out that the heavenly order and ordinances, which Christ hath appointed in His Testament, are but accidentals and no essential mark of the Established Church." (2) The *Preshyterian* Puritans, "the pharisees of these times; your great learned preachers; your 'good men;' that sigh and groan for reformation, but their hands with the sluggard deny to work;" "who, instead of Christ's government, set up their counterfeit 'discipline' in and over all the parish, making the popish churchwardens and perjured questmen 'elders'". . Their permanent synods and councils also, not here to speak of their new Dutch "classis," for therein is a secret.' (Hanbury, i. 38, &c. &c.; Strype, *Whitgift*, bk. iv. ch. xi.)

Calvin's 'pastors and doctors' were divine or human, is a question which has always stirred a very languid interest among the mass of mankind. And the only possible use to which these five executions could be put, was that to which they were actually put; viz. to remind statesmen that banishment were a much more humane and reasonable way of dealing with obstinate fanatics, than the infliction of death; and to accelerate the transition of the Church of England, from the Erastianism which had at first identified her with the State, towards the present intimate *alliance* with the State,—an alliance which leaves to both sides their necessary 'independence' of each other.

If it is in this sense that the modern Independents claim Barrowe and Penry as their martyrs, be it so. There are few Churchmen, in these days, who will withhold their sympathy from any bonâ fide advance made in the direction of liberty, or will stint their admiration of any men that can—in any reasonable sense—be called martyrs to a principle. But then the 'principle' must be one that is in advance of the martyr's own times; some truth for which the world was waiting, but which had not yet dawned upon the majority of mankind. It must not be some notion quite behind the average intelligence of the times. Would he be accounted a 'martyr of science' who suffered now-a-days for the Ptolemaic astronomy, or who died for the old world's belief in the philosopher's stone?

Any way, it is certain that after the death of these five Independents, no more executions took place. Those who could not bring themselves to obey the law of the land, and who refused to take the ordinary and legal methods for getting bad laws amended, were simply henceforth bidden to depart from the land. And

so an exodus of Brownists and other separatists took place; at first directed (under Robinson, Ainsworth, and others) to the friendly shores of Calvinistic Holland; but afterwards to the, as yet, infant colonies of North America. There the field was free, and the atmosphere full of fresh and healthy life. Virginia had been colonized thirteen years before, by a London company, in 1607; New York, in 1614, by the Dutch; and now New Plymouth (a little farther north) was settled by these adventurers, under the auspices of a Plymouth trading company, in 1620.

This Puritan migration to America was in every respect an important epoch, both in the religious and political history of our English race. It need not indeed be supposed that the bravery displayed, or the hardships undergone by the 'Pilgrim Fathers,' were greater than those which accompanied every attempt, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to colonize the rude and hostile shores of the new world. Nor must it be imagined that this emigration was the only one, of which the mainspring was supplied by the strong religious passions of those times. In the Spanish settlements of Mexico and Florida, Jesuitism had long before been extending its empire. In Canada, the French Huguenots had already planted their country's flag, which ere long threatened to float supreme over the whole new world, and to secure the ultimate supremacy of the Latin over the German race.

But two things were at this moment determining the matter otherwise: (1) the curious fact that here, on the opposite shore which mirrored the western face of Europe, the central post of advantage had been occupied by England,—while France lay northward of our settlements and Spain southward. So that unawares, and on a vast

scale, Nelson's well-known tactics had here been anticipated. The Franco-Spanish line had been cut in two; and between them was placed that vigorous English race, which was not slow to perceive and employ the golden opportunity. (2) But besides this, the natural vigour of the English colony was now reinforced in an unexpected way, by the sudden influx of a new and most important element—Puritanism. Religious intolerance, three hundred years ago, seems to have been used by Him, who 'out of evil still produceth good,' much in the same way as the discovery of gold in various quarters of the world has been so marvellously employed, to people the waste places of the earth, in later years. The Babel of excessive European concentration needed some great confusion to shatter it. And now, just when the old world was about to be counterbalanced by a new one, the character of that new world was at the critical moment finally determined by the influx of that very earnest, moral, well-to-do middle-class which was ere long to be victorious in the deadly struggle for political supremacy at home. There is little doubt, therefore, that in this sense the arrival of the 'Mayflower,' bearing the first-fruits of English Puritanism, in 1620, really was a crisis in the history of the world.

But now, on the smaller and ecclesiastical scale, it becomes highly interesting to observe what precisely, under these new conditions of perfect liberty, Puritanism will do. It can here, of course, display itself fearlessly in its true colours. And the suspicion that, as an Ecclesiastical system, it was at this time nothing whatever but an attempt to establish, at the sword's point and on principles of intolerance, Calvin's idea of a Biblical Church, will now easily receive disproof or confirmation.

In May, 1631, at the first court of election in Massachusetts, it was ordered that no person should be admitted to the rights of a citizen who was not previously admitted as a member of one of the churches[99]. In 1635, the celebrated Sir Harry Vane came out, and was elected governor: but even his influence was not sufficient to prevent Mrs. Hutchinson and an ultra-Calvinist party from being banished from the state[1]. Towards the end of the same year, Mr. Roger Williams, a Baptist minister and afterwards founder of the State of Rhode Island, 'having broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions,' was expelled from the colony[2]. In 1650, a code of laws was drawn up for Connecticut. It began thus: 'Whosoever shall worship any other God but the Lord, shall be put to death.' Then followed several other enactments, borrowed word for word from the Law of Moses. Blasphemy, adultery, sorcery, theft, disobedience to parents, were punished with death,—because Leviticus had so punished them: and people were forced by fines to attend divine service[3]. In July, 1651, a Mr. Obadiah Holmes, a Baptist, was 'well whipt;' and that so barbarously, that for some weeks he could only take rest upon his knees and elbows[4]. In 1656, attention was turned to the Quakers: and by a law of Massachusetts, passed on the 14th of October in that year, it was enacted that any Quaker landing on the coast should be seized and whipped; then imprisoned with hard labour; and finally expelled from the colony[5]. Nor were these laws suffered to remain a dead letter. Three Quaker

[99] Frost, *Hist. of the United States*, p. 66, cf. 76. 'The very men who had fled from England to gain an asylum for religious freedom, were refusing the slightest toleration to any opinions but their own.'

[1] *Ibid.* p. 68.

[2] Cramp, *Baptist Hist.* p. 415.

[3] De Tocqueville, *Démocratie en Amérique*, i. 62.

[4] Cramp, p. 409: he adds, 'Bonds and imprisonment awaited all Baptists in New England.'

[5] De Tocqueville, i. 64.

women were stripped to the waist, amid frost and snow, and flogged through eleven towns[6]. Four persons were hanged together, a drummer preventing any of their dying words from being heard. The very captains of vessels were flogged for bringing Quakers into port. And every Roman Catholic priest who returned, after one expulsion, was put to death[7]. In short, it may be truly said, 'the first Independents adhered to the doctrine, that it was the official duty of princes and magistrates to suppress and root out all false ministries, voluntary religions, and counterfeit worship of God[8];' and that the Presbyterians, who at home 'pleaded with tears for liberty of conscience, denied it to the first Anabaptist whom they met[9].'

But then, what becomes of these men's 'martyrdoms'? what becomes of their 'independency'? For, strange to say, 'it was the *Congregationalist* clergy by whom the magistrates in New England were instigated[10]:' just as in England under the Commonwealth, when the Quakers were whipped, imprisoned, and pilloried by thousands, 'their persecutors were for the most part Presbyterians and *Independents*[11].' Are we not driven of necessity to the conclusion, that whatever there was of vigorous life and progress, in the great Puritan movement of the six-

[6] George Fox, *Journal*, (Armistead's edition,) i. 389; ii. 210.

[7] De Tocqueville, i. 64.

[8] Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 34.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 21.

[10] Cramp, p. 411.

[11] Skeats, p 70. It is almost startling to find, in the pages of an intelligent Independent historian in the year 1862, this intolerance of his co-religionists in the seventeenth century condoned, and even praised, on precisely the same grounds as those which would have been maintained by Queen Elizabeth's statesmen in persecuting himself, had he lived at that day. 'It was natural that such onslaughts as were made upon its order by the Quakers, should be met with a determined resistance. Mrs. Hutchinson's antinomian virulence and activity were such as no Church, having any pretension to discipline, could tolerate . . . It belongs to the magistrates to coerce such people; and to make the coercion strong.' (Vaughan, *English Nonconformity*, pp. 141, 146.)

teenth and seventeeth centuries—and unquestionably there was abundance of both—was of a political[12], and not at all of a religious or ecclesiastical character? Are we not debarred from imagining that Calvinism was, in any modern view of the matter, an advance on the Catholicism of the Church of England? And must we not acknowledge, that to recommend 'Independency' to modern England, because 300 years ago it happened to be mixed up with a great forward movement of political freedom,—a freedom whose foundations were laid long ago by Mediæval Catholics, and to which whatever sound and lasting improvements were made in the seventeenth century, were made by a Long Parliament of Churchmen[13],—would be indeed an incredible culmination of confusion and folly?

Politically, indeed, the plot was now rapidly thickening. The pedantic James I., with his foolish 'king-craft,' had passed away; and was succeeded by a weak, vacillating, uxorious, and romantic successor,—who, desiring to be an Emperor, behaved like an ecclesiastic, and who allowed the chambers of his French queen to become the haunt of Jesuits and foreigners, burning with an eager desire to render England as subservient and docile, both in church and state, as France and Spain had then become. How could such a king, surrounded by a cloud of flatterers, and served by a Strafford and a Laud, possibly fail—except by a miracle—to bring the England

[12] See De Tocqueville, i. 65. 'Side by side with this penal legislation, so strongly coloured by the narrow spirit of sectarianism, we find placed, and as it were intertwined therewith, a body of *political* enactments which—drawn two centuries ago—seem even now to be in advance of the liberality of our own age. The general principles on which modern states rest, . . the intervention of the people in public affairs, free discussion of taxation, responsibility of ministers, personal liberty, and trial by jury,—all are there established, as facts beyond dispute.'

[13] Skeats, p. 49. 'The House of Commons which declared war against Charles was a House of Churchmen only.'

of the seventeenth century, or of any century, to rebellion? And once the barriers broken, and civil war declared, of course every private and sectarian grievance, every wild and preposterous theory, every personal and party hatred, instantly rushed to the easy opening and began to break down the embankments of society in every direction.

The story is too well known to need repeating here. Suffice it to call attention to two important facts: (1) that *politically*, the Great Rebellion was, in the long run, a great success; (2) that *ecclesiastically* it was, from beginning to end, a complete and even ludicrous failure. Politically,—it issued (in spite of occasional reactions) in that supremacy of the middle-class, which has lasted down to our own day, and which (having done its work) is about to be superseded by a more direct participation of the industrial classes in the affairs of the country. It secured that ordered freedom of the state, which—submitting to the checks and delays of parliamentary government,—is alone stable, reasonable, and popular. And it averted that most menacing danger,—bequeathed to England by the destruction of the feudal nobility in the Wars of the Roses, and by the downfall of the great independent abbots and bishops at the Reformation,—viz. a possible combination of all the powers of the state in one hand, ruling personally, not through the old English institutions of parliaments and common law courts, but through mere committees of Privy Council, the 'Star Chamber' Committee for matters of state and the (so-called) 'High Commission' for ecclesiastical affairs. For these most happy results, every Englishman—Churchman and Dissenter alike—now gives hearty thanks to God; and all are disposed to recognize, and to assign their full value to, the part borne

by either side in reaching at last the peaceful settlement of 1688.

Ecclesiastically,—on the other hand,—I do not scruple to say, that the results obtained by the triumphant Puritanism of the Commonwealth were anarchy and chaos to begin with, and a legacy of dissension and weakness ever since, which have delayed the spread of the Gospel among the heathen[14], have given endless occasion to the enemies of the Reformation to blaspheme, have divided English Christendom into a network of feeble and partitioned sects —the well-known breeding-places of many unchristian vices,—and have offered a hopeful opportunity for return to that greatest of all enemies to human progress, liberty, and veracity, the Jesuitized Neo-Romanism of these modern days. The only ecclesiastical benefit for which England has to thank the Independents of the Commonwealth is this,—that they delivered us from the then imminent danger of a Presbyterian establishment,—a thing which, in those days, meant the narrowest and most inquisitive clerical intolerance, a gloomy Calvinism in doctrine, Sabbatarianism in practice, and a degrading mental slavery to the mere letter of the Bible. From all these things many of the great

[14] 'The Baptist Congregation in this neighbourhood [at Monghyr, on the Ganges] was first collected by Mr. Chamberlain, an excellent man and a most active missionary,—but of very bitter sectarian principles, and entertaining an enmity to the Church of England almost beyond belief. He used to say that Martyn, Corrie, and Thomason were greater enemies to God, and did more harm to his cause, than fifty stupid, drunken "padres."' (Bishop Heber's *Indian Journal*, chap. x. vol. i. 135.) 'In India, as elsewhere, there are, and probably ever will be, divisions and discords such as sadly hinder the work of the Gospel. They are often such as cause shame to all sensitive Christians.' (Sir Bartle Frere, Essay in *The Church and the Age*, p. 377.) 'If you ever hope for one gleam of success in India, you must either settle your differences at home, or draw lots for the possession of the field.' (*Frazer's Magazine*, Dec. 1871, p. 720.)

Independents of the seventeenth century, although strict Calvinists in creed, were free. Yet the marvellous fact must in all fairness be added, that nothing else but the death of Cromwell (in 1658) seems to have prevented an Independent Church-establishment being set up in this country,—with toleration indeed for others who agreed with them in doctrine; but for those who disagreed, not only incapacity to receive any public maintenance, but even disqualification for holding any civil office[15].

However, the common misfortunes which fell upon both these religious bodies after the Restoration in

[15] This astonishing fact stands on the page of history, and cannot be cancelled. 'In 1657, Cromwell gave his consent to a petition from Parliament that *the Polity of the Independents might become the Church Polity of the nation.* Toleration, however, was to be granted to those who differed from them in worship and discipline,—but who agreed in doctrine. All others were to be without "protection," disqualified for holding any "civil" office, and "incapable of receiving the public maintenance appointed for the ministry." Two hundred delegates met at the Savoy, under the presidency of "the Dissenting brethren," and made a "Declaration of their Faith and order" .. But Cromwell passed away, and with him all hopes of Independency becoming the established religion of England.' (Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, i. 216.) 'Whatever might have been the ulterior design—whether, unhappily, a "national" establishment of religion, or not—of those divines concerned in the main subject of this chapter; it was probably frustrated by the intervention alone of an overruling Providence. By what party chiefly the measure was projected or promoted, does not appear; but we find that on May 25, 1657, the Protector gave his "consent" to "the humble petition," &c. The eleventh clause contains these words: "That the true Protestant Christian religion, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and no other, be held forth and asserted for the public profession of these nations; and that *a Confession of Faith, to be agreed by your Highness and the Parliament*, according to the rule and warrant of the Scriptures, be asserted, held forth, and recommended to the people of these nations; that none may be suffered .. to revile or reproach the Confession of Faith so agreed on; and such as possess faith in [the Trinity, &c.] shall be protected from all injury and molestation in the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; .. *so that this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy*... Such persons who agree not in matters of faith with the public profession aforesaid, shall not be capable of *receiving the public maintenance appointed for the Ministry.*"' (Hanbury, *Memorials of the Independents*, iii. 515.)

1660, and which too amply avenged their misuse of power during the Rebellion, at length drew them nearer together and necessitated a temporary alliance. For so great was now the national hatred and suspicion of all Puritans and 'Sectaries,'—especially when Venner's insurrection[16], in 1661, had suddenly opened the eyes of the government to the mines that Fifth-monarchy-men, and other wild fanatics, were digging everywhere beneath their feet,—that for the next ten years the king and Parliament vied with each other in inventing ever new schemes for getting rid of Dissent, if it were possible, altogether. This attempt began in 1661, with the passing of the 'Corporation Act:' in 1662, came the Act of Uniformity: in 1663, the Conventicle Act, —forbidding any religious assemblies of more than five persons, besides the master of the house and his family: in 1665, this was followed by the 'Five-mile Act,'—forbidding Dissenting ministers, who refused to declare it wrong to take up arms against the King, to approach any important town nearer than five miles: in 1670, the Conventicle Act was reinforced: and, in 1673, the Test Act was passed.

The meaning of all this is evident at a glance. It is simply a violent national reaction, extending through thirteen years, from that Puritan domination, from which the country had suffered so fearfully in the previous

[16] Burnet, *Own Times*, p. 104; Lingard, ix. 12; Baxter, *Autobiog.* p. 301. The horror and terror inspired by these fanatics may perhaps be pardoned, when it is understood that, even under the Commonwealth, 'they believed that . . the saints were to bring things as near as might be, before Christ's coming, to what they shall be when He is come . . Nothing remained to withstand them in England, but Presbyterian priests, corrupt lawyers, and a superannuated Parliament . . And when the saints had firmly established this in England they would wage war with the enemies of Christ, and the oppressors of His people, over the whole earth.' (*Life and Opinions of J. Rogers, a Fifth Monarchy-man*, p. 40.)

decade. It was yet one more determined effort to carry out,—in defiance both of fact and reason,—the original Lutheran (or Erastian) theory that the State and the Church are but two aspects of one body-politic; a theory, from which it would seem to follow that secession from the National Church was as much an act of 'treason,' as secession from the State. The attempt to impose this theory upon England had been made under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., by the direct despotic action of the Crown: under Elizabeth and the Stuarts, by the intervention of Royal Commissioners: under the Commonwealth, first by the Presbyterian 'Assembly,' and then by the Independent 'Parliament.' And this last method was now pursued by Charles II. But a theory which demands, on the one hand, that all men shall be compelled by the police to come to church[17]; and on the other, that the Church shall consent to take its tone and its commission from the world *to* whom it is sent, instead of taking it from Jesus Christ, *by* whom it is

[17] Yet even this—incredible as it may seem—was part of the programme of the 'Independent' Establishment, which was all but set on foot in the year of Cromwell's death, 1658. 'Further, on June 26th, the Protector gave his consent also to a stringent and rigid "Act for the better observance of the Lord's Day:" in which is this clause,—"And to the end no profane licentious person or persons whatsoever, may in the least measure receive encouragement to neglect the performance of religious and holy duties on the said day . . every person and persons shall—having no reasonable excuse for their absence, to be allowed by a Justice of the Peace of the county where the offence shall be committed—upon every Lord's Day diligently resort to some church or chapel where the true worship and service of God is exercised, or shall be present at some other convenient meeting-place of Christians, not differing in faith from the public profession of the nation, as it is expressed in 'the humble petition and advice of the Parliament,' &c. . . And every such person or persons so offending shall, for every such offence, being thereof convicted, forfeit the sum of two shillings and sixpence."' (Hanbury, *Memorials*, iii. 516.) Well may the satirist exclaim,

'For saints may do the same things by
The spirit, in sincerity,
Which other men are tempted to,
And at the devil's instance do!'

(Butler's *Hudibras*, ii. 2. 235.)

sent, is self-condemned, and must fall by its own want of consonance with the Gospel and with the facts of the modern age. We may indeed venture to doubt whether there be any essential difference, or anything more at issue than a question of scale and magnitude, between this theory and that of the Independents themselves. For the one determines on a very small scale that a certain community is a Church, and appoints teachers that shall echo its own views, and shall submit to its own control; while the other does precisely the same thing on a very large scale. But still, where men have acquired in any degree the habit of personal freedom, it is not by petty persecutions that they can be induced to conform to ideas which—whether in kind or only in degree—are not really consonant to their character or to their habits of life.

A far greater danger arises to such persons when a policy of a precisely opposite kind is pursued towards them. The moment of their greatest peril is the moment of their entire and assured success: just as the traveller, in the fable, was overcome by the warm and smiling sunshine; when the bluff winds of adversity had attempted him in vain. So it was with the Independents. The Act of Toleration was passed in 1689: and thereby every religious body gained a recognized legal position, —except the dreaded Romanists and the hated Unitarians[18]. Nay, even serious attempts were made at a comprehension of the Dissenters within the National Establishment. Independents, no less than Presby-

[18] 'Provided always, that neither this Act, nor any clause herein contained, shall extend . . to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any papist or popish recusant whatsoever; or to any person that shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the blessed Trinity.' (*Act of Toleration*, clause 17.)

terians, displayed in those days no reluctance to come in, and to receive their share, (as they had already done under the Commonwealth,) of the tithes and parsonages of the Church[19]. And when at last these repeated attempts were foiled by the strong opposition of the Clergy in the Lower House of Convocation, still the bounty of the State was accepted under another name, in 1723[20]. Many able men,—like Joseph Butler, afterwards Bishop of Durham; and Secker, a future Archbishop of Canterbury,—left Dissent for the Church of England. The number of Dissenters in the whole country sank to about 110,000[21]. And it seemed not unlikely that, in another fifty years, the whole Separatist movement would have spent its force, and English Dissent have become a thing of the past.

What then happened, to give affairs the quite new direction they have since taken? What was the cause of the new life and prosperity, which, within the present century, have made Dissent so strong a power, for good or evil, in this country? The question may be answered in one word: It was the great Wesleyan revival of personal religion,—a revival which began within the Church

[19] 'It was at that time [1688] fully intended to bring about a comprehension of the Presbyterians and the Independents in the Established Church; and it was known that these two principal sections of the Nonconformist body, provided that the Church services were modified, were willing (for the sake of Christian unity, and what was considered to be the strength of the Protestant interest) wholly to unite with the Church. In such an event, the tests which it was proposed to retain would bear only upon the Baptists, the Quakers, and the Roman Catholics.' (Skeats, *History of the Free Churches*, p. 98.)

[20] In 1690, William III. had given a Royal grant (the 'Regium Donum') to the Presbyterians in Ireland: and now a similar 'Regium Donum,' of £1000 a year, was given by George I., —nominally for the relief of ministers' widows. (Skeats, p. 319.)

[21] *Ibid.* p. 151, quoting a Return made to government; giving the Nonconformists in the province of Canterbury as 93,151: and in the province of York, as 15,525: total 108,676.

of England; but which the leaders of the Church at that time had not the fidelity or the skill to know how to employ for her advantage: and so they thrust it out from among them, to swell the ranks and revive the dying enthusiasm of Dissent. This curious chapter of Church history, however, will form the subject of a future Lecture. And all that remains for us to do now is to ask, in conclusion, what are the special tenets of the Independents: and whether they are such as, in these days, to justify a continued separation from the Church of England for their sakes?

III. The leading theory of the Independents is this: once grant the Calvinistic hypothesis,—that the Church is, in its highest sense, no organized, visible thing at all, but a mere spiritual body consisting of God's elect scattered throughout the world,—and it seems logically to follow, that high organization is a mischief rather than an advantage. To make the Church a strong and well-ordered power in the world, appears on the face of it to be a procedure at variance with the will of Christ; and to necessitate sacrifices,—especially sacrifices of discipline [22],—such as no worldly advantages (even were they permissible) could possibly counterbalance. Upon this axiom are built the three main tenets which characterize the Independent body, viz.:

(1) That in point of organization, the line must be drawn at 'the congregation.' All larger and grander schemes than that are wrong. Each separate and

[22] This notion was clearly stated by Dr. Stoughton, in his reply (No. 3335) before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on 'University Tests,' 1871: 'My reading of the history of England is this,—if you have a Church Establishment, you cannot carry out ecclesiastical discipline. Ecclesiastical discipline and voluntaryism go together.' It is obvious that he means 'discipline' in the strict, or Puritan, sense of the word. But that is distinctly *not* the Churchman's interpretation of the word.

isolated congregation therefore is, so to speak, a sovereign state. It enjoys an absolute and uncontrolled right to settle its own doctrine, ritual, and discipline[23]. And the method by which this congregational right is exercised is simply by *the vote of a majority.*

(2) That while thus repudiating every sort of ecclesiastical control, a congregation is of course under still more stringent obligation to reject every relic of *secular* control[24], and—above all things—to liberate both itself and others from the bondage (for so it, oddly enough, appears to them,) of a National Establishment and National Endowments. No religious body organized on so large a scale as that of a National Church is held to be safe from the danger of priestcraft. No acceptance of public money is held—at least, by modern Independents—to be compatible with that severe purity of discipline, which is thought to be a Church's foremost duty to her Lord. The voluntary system, therefore,—that is, the financial support of such organization as is permissible, by payments at the pleasure of the laity out of their *private property,*—is the only safe and allowable method of finance.

(3) That it is not enough to maintain this loose and curious system only as a matter of occasional expediency, or to resort to it as an experiment or as a human

---

[23] See 'Declaration of the Faith, Church Order, and Discipline of the Congregational or Independent Dissenters.' (*Congregational Year-Book* for 1871, p. xvii.) Art. I.: 'The Congregational Churches hold it to be the will of Christ that true believers should voluntarily assemble together to observe religious ordinances, &c., and that such a society of believers .. is properly a Christian Church.' Art. III.: 'They believe that the New Testament authorizes every Christian Church to elect its own officers, to manage all its own affairs, and to stand independent of and irresponsible to all authority,—saving that only of .. the Lord Jesus Christ.'

[24] 'They believe that the power of a Christian Church is purely spiritual, and should in no way be corrupted by union with temporal or civil power.' (*Ibid.* Art. IX.)

contrivance that may be altered or amended. No: it is seriously recommended to us, as a matter of awful and positive obligation. It is a divine, and not a human, system[25]. Submission to it is submission to the will of Christ: rejection of it is rejection of the command of Christ. Whereas every other system, every larger hierarchy, every wider and less rudimentary organization, are human and not divine,—systems of man's invention that dare at their peril to compete with *the system established by the Most High.*

Now it is on these three pillars that the whole structure of Congregationalism (or Independency) stands. And it is obvious at the first glance, that we have here the very quintessence of Dissent; that precisely what the Church used to call 'separation,' and the 'sin of schism,' is here elevated into a normal and satisfactory condition of things; and that the Independents are (as they themselves express it) 'Dissenters, not by the stress of circumstances, but of principles[26].' Such 'principles,' then, demand from us the most careful and thorough examination. For, if true, they overset the whole existing organization of Christendom. They convict the vast majority of the Christian Churches of a gross misconception as to what 'a Church' was meant to be. They open to us the gloomy vista of fifteen hundred years of sad disobedience to the plain words of Jesus Christ, and of abandonment—so far as polity is concerned—by that Holy Spirit which should lead men into truth; until, at last, the happy day dawned when Robert Browne arose to set things right. But

[25] 'The Congregational Churches . . hold the following doctrines as of *Divine authority*, and as the foundation of Christian faith and practice.' (*Congreg. Year-Book* for 1871, Preamble.) 'The *divine* institution of Congregational Independence.' (Fletcher, *Hist. of Indep.* ii. 29.)

[26] *Cyclopædia of Religious Denominations*, p. 193.

these results are so extraordinary and paradoxical, that a Christian man may be justified, I suppose, in feeling some hesitation and doubt about them; and may at least claim to institute an honest and searching criticism of these trenchant maxims, when they are submitted to his private judgment for acceptance, as marking the highest level which modern thought has yet attained,—or, perhaps, can ever attain,—on the subject of Ecclesiastical Polity.

And what if it should appear, on a very little examination, that every one of these three positions has—like some mediæval fortress—not by assault or by the stress of conflict, but simply by the march of events, the growth of experience, and the progress of modern intelligence, been left far behind the times, been rendered for practical purposes untenable, and become hopelessly obsolete and antiquated.

(1) Take the first of these three much-prized principles—the right of each separate congregation, worshipping together in the same building, to arrange, by a majority of lay votes, its doctrine, ritual, and discipline, according to its own views of duty, from time to time. This appears indeed a tempting bait. This seems a certain remedy against jealousy and discord. This is, surely, a better security for the rights of the laity, than a system which attempts the same thing through lay-patrons, lay-churchwardens, and the compulsory obedience of the clergy—not indeed to arbitrary lay volition—but to fixed laws [27], drawn up by the Church in the

[27] Subjection to *laws*—which are impersonal and impartial—has always been held by Englishmen to constitute 'freedom.' Subjection to *volition* has always hitherto been held by them to mean 'slavery.' The true condition of Dissenting ministers, in this respect, is well known to all those who have any acquaintance with the subject. It is fairly acknowledged in the following passage from a Dissenting writer:

first instance, and then sanctioned and enforced by a lay Parliament. How truly (it seems at first sight) may such congregations assume to themselves the title of 'Free Churches!'

Yet wait a while. Look a little deeper. To whom, we ask, does all this freedom and independence belong? Not in the least, it appears, to the 'congregation' who worship together, after all. They have, as such, no voice, no power, no freedom of any kind. It is only to a select and privileged *part* of the congregation that the whole power belongs. It is these, the so-called 'Church-members,' who alone manage the affairs of the Church, arrange the ritual, settle the doctrine, dispose of the finances, appoint and dismiss the pastor. It is an oligarchy, then, after all; and not a 'religious republic.' It is a close body; and not an open one. And what is more, it is a body which decides, without appeal, on all admissions within its own circle; and fixes, without any constitutional checks whatever, the conditions and qualifications of membership. But how can institutions organized after this fashion arrogate to themselves the peculiar title of 'free churches'? How can they claim,—while they avowedly reduce the ruling powers of the pastor to insignificance, and leave the mass of the seat-holders without any representation whatever,—to make singular provision for the independence of the congregation? It is only an intermediate body, after all, a sort of middle-class (as it were)

—'In point of strict law, nothing can be more insecure than the position of the Congregational minister. He is, at most, only tenant at will to the trustees... The average length of Congregational pastorates is commonly set down at a very low figure.' About half the present number of Baptist pastors, e.g., have held their posts for less than five years. (*Religious Republics*, p. 27.) See also Rev. Brewin Grant, *The Dissenting World: an Autobiography*, p. 217; and Maitland, *Voluntary System*, p. 283.

in the congregation, which has assumed to itself the powers and attributes of the whole body of worshippers. What is this, but a most imperfect conception of liberty, — a conception which was much in vogue half a century ago; but which satisfies no one now. For higher and larger views of polity are dawning on mankind; and the well-to-do trading classes, which seized the sceptre at the Great Rebellion, have been summoned to take cognisance of a grander and nobler idea than that of a plutocracy, or of the divine right of capital and private property to do all that it *will* with its own. Yet such is, in few words, the true meaning of the boasted 'Voluntary system.' Such, and no more, is the boasted freedom of the 'free churches.'

But let us look a little closer still. Suppose any member of the mere congregation desire to obtain admission to the inner and more privileged circle, what is required of him? He is first of all reminded that the Church-body consists of those persons alone who can 'give evidence to each other of their being Christians[28].' And he accordingly must give evidence. He must receive a visit from two or three of the deacons, and, perhaps, the pastor of the flock; and must submit to the ordeal of being examined by them as to his spiritual condition[29]. 'He narrates (to quote from an Independent writer) the story of his awakening to spiritual consciousness, of the hours of secret penitence through which he has passed, of the inward conflicts through which he has fought his way into the kingdom of God, and of those more gentle drawings of the Spirit of God by which he has been led to a knowledge of

[28] *Cyclopædia of Religious Denominations*, p. 191.

[29] *Congregational Year-Book* (1871), p. 58.

the Saviour[30].' The results of this interview are then reported to the Church-body; and a vote of the majority decides the question of admission or rejection.

Two things, surely, at the outset are quite clear,—and indeed they are honestly confessed by more than one distinguished member of the Independent communion. The first is, that such a system as this would be sure to *exclude* the most highly spiritual, the most refined, the most educated, the most sensitive members of the congregation from all share in its government, from communion at the Lord's table, and from all the other privileges of Church-membership[31]. And the second is, that it would be equally sure to *include* many a hypocrite and many a self-deceiver. For 'how, (asks the same Independent writer,) if a man should be simply using unctuous phrases, . . with which the clever hypocrite never finds any difficulty in making himself acquainted, . . how is the Church to unmask the deception[32]?' How, indeed?

But with this we are not at present concerned. The unquestionable evidence of Dissenters themselves was

[30] *Ecclesia:* a series of Essays, by Members of the Independent denomination (1870), p. 490.

[31] 'To some the idea of an investigation into their private religious experience by comparative strangers, in order that a report of the results may be made to a meeting of the Church, is so distasteful and repellant, that they at once turn away from the community which requires it. They shrink, with a sensitiveness which it is impossible not to respect, from laying bare their most sacred feelings, . . to visitors whose want of tact in the prosecution of their inquiries may very possibly furnish little guarantee that their judgment will be formed with wisdom and discrimination. Others object to it on the ground of principle, as well as of feeling. They regard the whole proceeding as essentially inquisitorial in its character.' (*Ecclesia*, p. 483.) The spirit of this admirable Essay (No. viii.) is that of the Church, rather than of Dissent. Cf. *Christian Year*, Fourth Sunday in Lent:

> 'E'en human love will shrink from sight,
> Here in the coarse rude earth:
> How then should rash intruding glance
> Break in upon her sacred trance,
> Who boasts a heavenly birth?'

[32] *Ecclesia*, p. 491.

hardly needed, in support of a truth of human nature discovered and applied by the Church more than a thousand years ago: viz. that a 'discipline' such as that dreamed of by Congregationalism, and for the sake of which Congregationalism exists, is a simple impossibility: that it may easily become a dangerous delusion: and that 'the vital principle of the Church may be retained, even though the Church should disclaim the responsibility involved in the judgment of the inner life, and should leave each individual to determine [these things] for himself[33].' What we are now concerned with is this: to point out the simple fact, that the Independent system,—which makes such loud pretensions to 'freedom,' and compares itself so advantageously with the Church of England in this respect,—stands in reality on a lower level altogether[34], and represents an obsolete notion of what freedom really means. Its institutions are, in point of fact, not of a 'republican' but of an oligarchical nature, and are therefore liable to fall prostrate at the feet of some influential tradesman or some wealthy and determined deaconess[35]. And this sort of 'liberty' is one to which Englishmen in these days absolutely refuse that honoured and almost sacred name. No: such a system is obsolete, and cannot live. And should it ever succeed—which God forbid!—

[33] *Ecclesia*, p. 488: cf. 496. 'As a safeguard for the purity of the Church it is illusive; and yet a grievous burden is laid on the individual conscience.'

[34] The government of the Church of England—like that of the State—is not committed to the will of a mere popular majority, (which is the Dissenting system, and is for certain purposes the most effective,) but is conducted by representation. And Mr. Herbert Spencer tells us, that, 'whether considered in theory or in practice, representative government is the best for securing *justice* . . . And it is the form of government natural to a very highly organized and advanced social state.' (*Essays*, second series, 1863, p. 226.)

[35] Arist. *Polit.* iv. 4. 3: Δῆμος μέν ἐστιν, ὅταν οἱ ἐλεύθεροι κύριοι ὦσιν ὀλιγαρχία δ' ὅταν οἱ πλούσιοι.

in overthrowing the *really* free and popular system of the Church of England[36], it is (we may feel quite sure) the very last religious system, of all now existing in this country, which would take her place or succeed to her inheritance.

(2) But perhaps the second main pillar on which Independency rests is more solid, and will better bear the test of an impartial examination under the light of modern ideas. Let us see. This second grand principle is,—that a national religious establishment is a wrong and an absurdity[37]: that an endowment by

[36] As to 'freedom' in other ways,—it has been abundantly shown within the last few years, that an Established religious community presents far more favourable conditions for its enjoyment, than a so-called Free Church. 'The Church of England,' says a liberal journalist, 'is, no doubt, in a state of difficulty and trial. But from what does that difficulty arise? It arises exclusively from the circumstance, that no other religious body in this country contains so many honest and truthful men, alive to the paramount necessity of discovering and proclaiming the truth—be it what it may.' (*Pall Mall Gazette*, Dec. 5, 1866.) 'Let Great Britain,' says a French writer, 'rest in her so-called "heresy." The Established Church possesses the rare merit of adapting herself to the complicated workings of constitutional institutions. . . The reliance of the English clergy must be in their moral force, and in the first principle of the Reformation,—I mean in liberty.' (Esquiros, *Religious Life in England*, sub fin.). 'While some of the most servile adherents to a doctrine [of Infallibility] which their own most learned theologians have denounced as false and mischievous are drawn from the so-called free and voluntary sections of the Catholic Churches of England, Ireland, and America,—its most determined opponents are found in the independent spirit manifested by the national, endowed, and established Churches of Germany, Hungary, and France.' (Dean Stanley, *Essays*, &c., 1870, p. xiii.)

[37] 'As a general rule, the business of life is better performed when those who have an immediate interest in it are left to take their own course, uncontrolled either by the mandate of the law or by the meddling of any public functionary . . But if the workman is generally the best selector of means, can it be affirmed with the same universality, that the consumer or person served is the most competent judge of the end? Is the buyer always qualified to judge of the commodity? If not, the presumption in favour of the competition of the market does not apply to the case; and if the commodity be one, in the quality of which society has much at stake, the balance of advantages may be in favour of some mode or degree of intervention, by the authorized representatives of the collective interest of the State. . . This is peculiarly true of those things which are chiefly useful *as tending to raise the character* of human beings. The uncultivated cannot be competent judges

*private* property is sound and right enough, but an endowment by *public* property is an apple of discord, a certain means of corrupting the Church that is selected for endowment, contrary to the will of God, and in direct opposition to the examples of Holy Scripture. And in the maintenance of this thesis, a strength of language is habitually employed by Independent writers, which forms a curious contrast to the studied moderation of speech with which the subject has lately been introduced into Parliament. No one will contend for a moment that the rightful and useful employment, not only of State grants, but also of all endowments attached to religious and educational establishments, is not a proper and necessary subject for occasional parliamentary inquiry. Indeed it is believed that there are not a few Nonconformist endowments, at the present day, of an obsolete or mischievous character[38], which

---

of cultivation . . It will continually happen on the "Voluntary system" that, the end not being desired, the means will not be provided at all; or that, the persons requiring improvement having an imperfect and altogether erroneous conception of what they want, the supply called forth by the demand of the market will be anything but what is really required.' (Mill, *Political Economy*, v. 11. 7.) That this miserable withholding of more than is meet from the support of the ministry, not only 'will' happen, but *has* happened and *is* continually happening, under the 'Voluntary system,' is candidly acknowledged by Dissenters themselves. At the autumnal meeting of the Congregational Union, in 1871, 'the following resolution was adopted, *nem. con.:* — that the Assembly . . recognizes the inadequacy of the provision which is made for the temporal support of many of the ministers of those churches; that it approves the principle of a fund in aid.' (*Congregational Year-Book*, 1871, p. 74.) And for abundant proof in detail, not only of the scanty maintenance, but also of the permanent dependence, and the often heartless disappointments, to which Independent ministers are liable, — let any one read Maitland's *Voluntary System*, passim; or even trust to his own observations in any part of England.

[38] Take, for instance, the endowments attached to a 'Seventh Day Baptist' chapel, in Mill-yard, London. 'It was rebuilt in 1790, but founded more than a century before that . . On Saturdays, this little old-fashioned meeting-house is opened twice a day . . Here in England [this sect] have dwindled down to two skeleton congregations, an endowment, and a Chancery suit. *As there is money, a form of worship is kept up; though for all practical purposes the cause is dead.*

might with advantage be reported upon to Parliament, with a view to a better and more liberal employment of their funds. But, language such as is used by Dissenters towards the Church it may be reasonably hoped that Churchmen will never condescend to use towards Dissent. 'The Establishment,' writes Mr. Miall, 'is a life-destroying upas, deeply rooted in our soil. It desecrates religion, . . in its eyes immorality and licentiousness are trifles. It is at once a blunder, a failure, and a hoax[39].' Mr. Binney openly records his opinion, that 'it destroys more souls than it saves[40].' Mr. Dale 'denies the Church of England to be a true Church at all[41].' Another judges it to be 'Antichristian, unscriptural, and corrupt[42].' And another considers 'the union between Church and State, in any country, to be unprincipled, absurd, and mischievous[43].'

Why?—we ask, in incredulous amazement. Is the England in which we live, then, so degraded, ruined, miserable a country, as surely under this hypothesis it ought to be? Is piety quite worn out among us? Is religion a power that has ceased to be? Is the 'failure' so patent, the 'blunder' so obvious, that we dare not—after a Church Establishment of some 1200 years—hold up our heads as a Christian people? Or does any one believe—beyond the limits of the very narrowest Dissenting circles—that all the goodness and piety that is among us is due to Nonconformity alone? Are there

There may be four grown-up persons, besides the pew-opener, to form the morning service: there are just as many in the afternoon.' (Ritchie, *Religious Life of London*, 1870, p. 160.)

[39] Miall's *Nonconformist's Sketch-book* (1842), pp. 16, 185, 212.

[40] *Address at opening of the Weighhouse Chapel* (1834), p. 52.

[41] *Lecture on the Pilgrim Fathers*, (1854), p. 13.

[42] Foster, ap. *Christian Witness*, Feb. 1847.

[43] Baptist Noel, *Essay on Church and State* (1849), p. 238. I am indebted, for some of these references, to the *Church and State Handy-book*.

not many persons, and those not the least observant of mankind, who hold that the very best specimens of Englishmen and of Christians to be met with in this country, are precisely those who have been trained under the tranquil teaching and comely ritual of the Established Church?

No:—we say to ourselves,—there must be some misunderstanding here, some ruinous mistake as to what a 'Church' was intended by our Lord to be, some historical ignorance as to what the Church of England has really done, some verbal confusion as to what 'failure,' 'Christian,' 'scriptural,' really ought to mean. Else, it were impossible that men under whose teaching one would, on many accounts, gladly sit, could bring charges against a great religious society which the very slightest interior acquaintance with that society bars at once with a positive contradiction. The fact is simply this: that, in controversy, men do not make sufficient allowance for the extraordinary refraction produced by antipathy and bias[44]. There is assuredly no conscious unfairness in

[44] See, for instance, in the sixteenth century the almost incredible scurrility and blasphemy of Thomas Becon against 'that wicked idol, the Masse.' One would say, he could never have understood the commonest and most obvious truths, about either its history or its meaning. And yet for the first thirty years of his life (b. 1511), it must have been to him the principal means of grace, and after ordination one of his daily recurring duties. (Becon's Works, *Prayers*, &c., p. 253.) In the seventeenth century, no better instance could be found than John Lilburne: 'The Church of England, exclaimed Lilburne, is the creation of the Bishops, the Bishops derive their authority from the Pope, and the authority of the Pope has come from the Devil.' (Vaughan, *English Nonconformists*, p. 157.) For the eighteenth century, take Micaiah Towgood, 'whose work for three generations remained the standard work on this subject, and which has been more frequently reprinted, both in England and America, than any other publication of the kind.' (Skeats, p. 489.) This work is a tissue of misunderstandings from beginning to end. Unlike John Lilburne, he represents the object of his aversion, 'the Church of England, as a civil establishment, founded upon acts of Parliament as the only authentic rule of what is to be believed and practised therein.' (Towgood, *Dissent Justified*, p. 17, twelfth edition.)

these men[45]. But the oar that looks broken beneath the water, is with great ado and alarm pronounced and believed by them to be really broken.

An ignorant Protestant, for instance, goes into a foreign cathedral to witness a High Mass. And to him it seems nothing but a heap of unmeaning, childish, and unchristian mummeries. But meantime an uninstructed Romanist attends an Independent meeting-house; and to him the service is a perfectly ludicrous, cold, unedifying, and burdensome piece of ceremonial. Where he had been accustomed to see an altar, leading his thoughts straightway to Jesus and to 'the Lamb in the midst of the elders as it had been slain[46],' he sees a cushioned pulpit. The priest who pleaded amid touching symbols the great atoning sacrifice, is replaced by a lecturer on the Bible. The noble liturgies of the early Church have made way for the extempore effusions of an individual. The place of worship, in short, seems to him to have become a preaching-house[47]. And every breath of poetry from the South, every touch of symbolism from the East, every trace of Greek freedom and masterhood in the management both of doctrinal matter and of artistic form, every relic of strong Roman obedience, order and majesty,—seem to him to have fled; and Catholicity to have given place to a bald French Calvinism, capable of imagining nothing whatever but a sermon.

[45] Of course far more than this is to be said of the honourable candour of men, who really know what they are writing about; such as appears in the following passage of Dr. Stoughton on the Prayer-book: 'As the sources whence the book was compiled are so numerous and so ancient, belonging to European Christendom in the remotest times . . the bulk of what the book contains, including all that is most beautiful and noble, ought to be regarded as the rightful inheritance of every one who believes in the essential unity of Christ's Catholic Church.' (Stoughton, *Two Hundred Years Ago*, p. 221.)

[46] *Rev.* v. 6.

[47] Αὔχουσι προίστασθαι διατριβῆς μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκκλησίας. (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii.)

Yet we know that neither conception would be wholly true. We know how much there is to be said for both these forms of worship; and what numerous points of interest occur in both to the instructed eye. In the first, there survives the spontaneous over-luxuriant ritual growth of many ages; in the last, the violent and conscious effort of the sixteenth century to be rid of an intolerable ultra-ceremonialism at a blow.

But meanwhile, the effects of these misapprehensions have been disastrous. They have given credence and currency to legendary histories of almost ludicrous falseness and party spirit; and as mischievous to Christian brotherhood and good order, as the pseudo-English Histories which are said to have been taught for a long time in America, or as the fatal Napoleonic legend, so long industriously cultivated by M. Thiers, has proved in France. In history thus distorted, the Church of England is made to figure as a fell and bloody tyrant, eager for prey, delighting in persecution of the saints, bent on obstruction, and glorying in shameful outrages upon men's liberty and conscience[48]. No word is uttered to remind men, that it was this same Church, nevertheless,

[48] The discordances and self-contradictions which prevail among second-rate Dissenting historians, concerning the Church of England, surpass all belief. Even such respectable writers as Messrs. Bogue and Bennett can condescend to the following confusions: 'The Dissenters were persecuted with tenfold fury; for, availing himself of Monmouth's rebellion to crush the enemies of *popery* and arbitrary power, the King [James II., a Romanist] turned his realm into a slaughter-house. . . Several ministers of the establishment forsook it, as unworthy the name of a Church of Christ, since *it was stained* with the blood of the saints.' (*History of Dissenters*, i. 84.) Again, 'The Reformation of the English Establishment retrograded, rather than advanced, after the reign of Edward.' (*Ibid.* p. 39.) The 'Establishment,' therefore, was clearly in existence under Edward VI. But yet it seems, 'the Commons House of Parliament, the temporal peers, . . and Queen Elizabeth, the sovereign of the land, brought the Church of England into being,—like Adam, full grown, with all her soul and body.' (*Ibid.* p. 102.) After this, we can be surprised at nothing in writers of an inferior calibre.

which first curbed the aristocratic insolence of feudal force, which produced the emancipation of the serfs, gave the model and impetus to parliamentary government, preserved art and literature and all that opened a career to the lower ranks of society, and in our own days has laboured with a noble self-devotion (while Dissent has done comparatively nothing) in educating the masses of our fellow-countrymen. No distinction is attempted to be drawn between repressive measures which were purely the work of the State—often pre-eminently of the House of Commons[49]—and those which may more fairly be ascribed to ecclesiastics: though even then (as we have already seen), to ecclesiastics of all denominations alike. Nor do we find any proper care taken to discriminate between conflicts and sufferings that belong to the histories of two or more perfectly distinct, and often hostile, sects[50]. All are pressed into the service of theological hatred and party strife. And the profoundly interesting history of the great political transition from feudal aristocracy to the ascendency of the middle class[51],

[49] Take, for instance, the much abused 'Act of Uniformity,' 1662: 'Considered as an act of the State-Church,' we are bitterly told, 'it was a fatal blunder' (Skeats, p. 73), and the penalties that followed on it,—'long and weary imprisonments, banishment, and starvation,—satisfied the episcopal bench.' (*Ibid.* p. 75.) But other Dissenting writers are a little more careful of the truth: 'We must now return to the House of Commons. On the 1st of March (1662), the Members . . were introduced to the King. "Gentlemen," he observed, "I hear you are very zealous for the Church, and very solicitous, and even jealous, that there is not expedition enough used in this affair. I thank you for it."' (Stoughton, *Two Hundred Years Ago*, p. 264.) 'The Commons still farther added to the severity of the measure.' (*Ibid.* p. 268.) 'Parliament was quite prepared to do all that the Episcopalians desired, and even more.' (Fletcher, *History of Independency*, iv. 198.)

[50] 'These two had lived in much friendship and agreement under tyranny.. as it is the talent of fellow-sufferers to do,—men in misfortune being like men in the dark, to whom all colours are the same. But when they came forward into the world, and began to display themselves to each other and to the light, their complexions appeared extremely different.' (Swift, *Tale of a Tub*, § vi.)

[51] 'The History of England during the seventeenth century, is the history of the transformation of a

—a history embracing all the whole period from the Wars of the Roses to the accession of William III.,—is travestied into a sectarian battle of kites and crows, where ecclesiastics figure as the main authors and movers of the tedious and noisy strife.

The thing were incredible, if it were not true. But the fact is, that men are habitually more interested in watching and describing the fortunes of their own small clan or favourite theological party, than in admiring the providential method by which men of *both* parties in the Church and in the State have been combined to bring into being the glorious England of to-day; to ward off, on the one hand—by Puritan vigour and obstinacy—the threatening danger of a Stuart autocracy; to heal, on the other—by the welding and organizing instincts of the Churchman—that republican disunion which, even before Cromwell's death[52], bade fair to crumble the nation into fragments and lay her prostrate beneath a vast irresistible Latin empire, which would have been the curse and bane of mankind for untold generations[53].

---

limited monarchy, constituted after the fashion of the middle ages, into a limited monarchy suited to that more advanced state of society, in which the public charges can no longer be borne by the estates of the Crown, and in which the public defence can no longer be entrusted to a feudal militia.' (Macaulay, *History of England*, i. 72.)

[52] 'This land is become in many places already a Chaos, a Babel, another Amsterdam; yea worse,—we are beyond that and in the highway to Munster, if God prevent it not.' (Edwards' *Gangræna*, part i. p. 57.) 'To have our peace and interest, whereof those were our hopes the other day, thus shaken and put under such a confusion; and ourselves rendered hereby almost the scorn and contempt of those strangers [Dutch ambassadors and the like] who are amongst us to negotiate their masters' affairs! To give them opportunity to see our nakedness, as they do!' (Carlyle, *Cromwell*, ii. 302.)

[53] How imminent this danger was, let the following passage declare. 'The King of England offered to declare himself a Roman Catholic, to dissolve the Triple Alliance, and to join with France against Holland, if France would engage to lend him such military and pecuniary aid as might make him independent of his Parliament. Lewis at first affected to receive these propositions coolly . . Nevertheless, the propositions made by the Court of Whitehall were most welcome to him. He already medi-

Waiving aside, then, not without some indignation, the violent and repulsive language in which this second great principle of Independency is too often expressed,—what, now, is the truth of the matter? It is, that this strange worship of 'private property,' this extraordinary narrowness of view,—which can rise to the conception of a Church-polity on the scale of a vestry-meeting, but cannot go beyond,—is also an obsolete idea; and is left far behind by the nobler and broader conceptions of modern times[54]. If anything is certain, it is that the growing democracy of our age is teeming with an idea which already, in a blind and unskilful way, has found expression; and which only needs a little sympathizing guidance to show its essential accordance with Christianity and with the Catholic spirit of the Church[55], as distinguished from the particularism of

tated gigantic designs, which were destined to keep Europe in constant fermentation during more than forty years. He wished to humble the United Provinces, and to annex Belgium, Franche Comté, and Lorraine to his dominions. Nor was this all. The King of Spain was a sickly child . . A day would almost certainly come, and might come very soon, when the House of Bourbon might lay claim to that vast Empire on which the sun never set . . England would turn the scale. On the course which, in such a crisis, England might pursue, the destinies of the world would depend . . A secret treaty was signed at Dover, in May, 1670 . . Charles bound himself to employ the whole strength of England, by sea and land, in support of the right of the House of Bourbon to the vast monarchy of Spain. Lewis, on the other hand, engaged to pay a large subsidy, and promised that, if an insurrection should break out, he would send an army at his own charge to support his ally.' (Macaulay, *History of England*, i. 98. Cf. Bissett, *Omitted Chapters in English History*, ii. 19.)

[54] The anxiety which already possesses the 'Dissenting Interests,' and urges them to hurried action, is thus fairly confessed by Rev. Baldwin Brown:—'This spirit of democracy is an advancing and, in its present aspect, a menacing power. The next great experiment in the organization of society will be under its auspices. This tendency to universal organization is a tremendous power. . . Instead of rejoicing that Christianity, under the auspices of the Establishment principle, will fall naturally and easily into the new order, we should pray earnestly to be delivered from an endowed democratic Church.' (*Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1871, p. 320.)

[55] 'L'égalite commence à penetrer par l'Eglise au sein du gouvernement; et celui qui eût vegété, comme "serf" dans un éternel esclavage,

Dissent. It is, in few words, the idea that the absolutism of mere 'capital'—which 'knows no country,' and owns no obligations to any one—is nearly over: that property is a trust, and has duties as well as rights: that the highest ideal of human society is rather community than isolation, rather confederacy than individualism: and that not petty private schemes, mutually jealous and obstructive[56], but institutions on the broad and public scale, are those wherein power and efficiency are generated,—where the self-denial and self-sacrifice of the many are husbanded from waste, and are made to co-operate towards the successful issue of large and well-planned enterprises.

'What,' say our working classes, 'is the meaning of this "private property," this "voluntary system," this absolute right of every man to do whatsoever he *will* with his own? Is there no one who will stand up and teach us, in the name of *common sense*, that if the individual is the root and the beginning of human society, he is not the flower and the crown thereof[57]? Is there no man of *culture* who will come forward, and shew that there are whole races of men who have never yet been able fully to understand what this strange right of the individual against the community exactly means: nay, that our own German race—no effete descendants of a worn-out Latin imperialism, but breathing the fresh and bracing atmosphere of nature and simplicity—established wherever it came the feudal system; and held fast, throughout the middle ages, to the idea

---

se place comme prêtre au milieu des nobles.' (De Tocqueville, *Democ. en Amérique*, I. p. iii. 1st series.)

[56] Mill, *Polit. Econ.* v. 11. 16.

[57] *Φανερὸν ὅτι τῶν φύσει ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ, καὶ ὅτι ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον· καὶ ὁ ἄπολις (διὰ φύσιν καὶ οὐ διὰ τύχην) ἤτοι φαῦλός ἐστιν, ἢ κρείττων ἢ ἄνθρωπος.* (Arist. *Polit.* i. 2. 9.)

of public property standing on duties, rather than that of private property standing on rights? And, lastly, is there no man of God, who, in the name of *Christianity*, will teach us that the Lord and His disciples—the embryo Christian Church—had a common purse: that the earliest society of believers practised community of goods: that, altered in mere shape and outward expression, the spirit and teaching and institutions of the Catholic Church have been the same from that day down to this,—preaching in every practicable way the softening down of the hard inequalities of heathenish ordinary life; opening a career to men of every rank; breaking down with all its might the ever-recurring partition-walls of clique and caste; and bidding men combine on the largest possible scale, with "brotherhood" for the motto of their system, and self-denying orderly "co-operation" for its method[58]'?

That this is the conception which is floating before the minds of modern men, this the voice which is already vibrating in the air of our modern times, no one—who has ears to hear and eyes to see—can possibly deny[59]. It may be called democracy. But that does not alter the case. Some people call it Christianity; and aver

[58] 'To come now to the favourable, the hopeful view of these prospects. The things needful to the improvement of the condition of the working classes are: a general and higher *education*, a friendly, open, non-aggressive *federation* of the labouring classes throughout the civilized world, and *Christianity*. These are, in my opinion, the three grand essentials.' (*Contemp. Review*, Dec. 1871, p. 93: art. by Thos. Wright, 'the journeyman engineer.')

[59] E.g.: 'It is scarcely possible to reflect with patience upon the fact, that nearly eight million acres of land which might have been retained at a very small cost as public property, have been suffered to fall into the possession of private hands; and that, year by year, additional thousands are being diverted from the public in the same manner.' (Art. on 'The Preservation of Commons,' in *Fraser's Magazine*, Sept. 1871, p. 301.)

that it only needs a skilful and kindly direction, to become a power for good and not for evil in the world; to become a power which shall raise—like the fresh vocal tide on some dead silent shore—the helpless stranded barks to life and beauty and mutual aid once more, and shall produce effects of a scale and efficiency which have, as yet, been hardly dreamed of.

And now, what are we to say to a religious system, which comes forward amidst the dawn of such a period as this, to preach once more the dying doctrines of a middle-class ascendency; which proclaims once more the divine right of small Independent coteries; gives an actual *consecration,* at length, to the most extreme theories of 'private property;' repudiates in sacred things—which have always furnished the prelude and the model to secular arrangements—all organization on the grand scale [60], all publicity and national union; and would fain establish the most important by far of all our social institutions—the National Church—upon a mere Voluntary system, and on the base idea of men's private rights, instead of the noble and inspiring one of their public duties? What else can be said, but

[60] The evidences of this growing taste for organization on the grand, and not on the petty scale, meet one sometimes in the most unexpected quarters. Here is a passage from *The Twenty-second Annual Report of the Poor-law Board,* 1869–70, p. xv. 'The extreme parsimony displayed by Boards of Guardians of the older school has, in some of the larger unions, given way to a desire to conduct all the duties devolving upon the guardians upon a somewhat grand and liberal scale. The guardians of a Lancashire union, for instance, have built one of the best infirmaries in the kingdom . . and lately they were found to be erecting a greenhouse, to supply the infirmary with flowers. . . In another union, we had to object to the elevation, as being of a more ornamental and costly character than was necessary—particularly to the addition of a tower; and granite columns and terra-cotta enrichments had to be struck out. In another instance, we refused to sanction proposals to introduce encaustic tile paving in the entrance-hall, moulded Portland-stone stairs to the chapel; . . and Portland-stone decorations to the front of the building.'

that such a system is obsolete and self-condemned? And were the legislature to commit the country irrevocably to an ecclesiastical policy dictated by an active minority possessed by these narrow views,—at the very moment of transition, when the middle-class is being called upon to part with its exclusive ascendency, and to share the government of the country with a class possessed of totally different ideas,—such a course would be a flagrant breach of a most solemn trust, and a crime little short of treason to the State.

For here is something quite other than an Irish Church question. There the problem was essentially a numerical one. There honest statistics were not withheld[61]; and the course, therefore, of political justice was clear. Six hundred thousand Churchmen[62], amid a

[61] It is impossible, as an Englishman, not to feel a sense of shame, on recalling the following facts: (1) That in 1851, a quasi-religious census was obtained,—by a method which gave every advantage to the Dissenters, and by a calculation whose accuracy is now universally repudiated; and that the result, even then, giving fifty-six per cent. of the (so-called) 'worshipping' population to the Church of England, and only forty-four per cent. to all the other denominations put together: this ratio has been, for twenty years, inscribed on all the banners of Dissent, as giving 'half the population of England' to their side: (2) That in 1861, a serious effort on the part of Churchmen to obtain the simple truth on this question, was thwarted by Dissenters for another ten years: (3) That, in 1871, another effort to obtain *bonâ fide* statistics was thwarted in the same way, for another ten years to come. No man can believe, surely, that a policy of obscuration can answer, in the long run, in England.—As to the *honesty* of the 1851 statistics, discoveries of the following sort are perpetually bringing it into discredit. A chapel in Leeds is registered as affording room for 200 persons; on Census Sunday, 1851, it returns its 'worshippers' as,—morning, 650; afternoon, 723; evening, 1030. A chapel in Marylebone accommodates 198 persons; its returns were—morning, 277; evening, 336. (*Church and State Handy-Book*, p. 55.) In Wales, visits to three chapels, impartially chosen, on a casual Sunday in 1870, verified the Census returns as follows,—the three chapels had returned 900 'worshippers' between them: the actual attendance, when visited, was found to be respectively, 19, 25, and 45. (*Guardian*, Sept. 21, 1870.)

[62] 'We need unity. We are only some 600,000 against the combined forces of the Church of Rome.' (*Irish Eccl. Gaz.*, Dec. 22, 1871, p. 262.)

population of six millions, were enjoying all the benefits and advantages of a national establishment. Long before any such ratio shall have been arrived at in England, it is perfectly certain that English Churchmen themselves will appeal to Parliament for relief from an intolerable position. But the question, on this side the Irish Channel, is confessedly not one of numbers, but of principles. For it is not contested that Churchmen outnumber in England all the other denominations put together. Here therefore it is the question of retaining, for the benefit of coming generations, a most important national institution;—an institution which has lasted for twelve hundred years; and which as an engine of education and discipline concerns the lower orders more nearly than any others. Yet this it is proposed to throw to the winds before their very eyes, to waste it with its vast accumulation of influence and property, to reduce it from a *public* and open to a close and *private* society,—and that, not in order to benefit any single person or institution in the country, nor to satisfy one single Christian or noble aspiration; but merely to satisfy the jealousy of those who are already (we are told) in a position of far greater freedom and efficiency, and to respond to a cry, never yet listened to in England,—never (I think) likely to be listened to,—a cry, not for 'liberty,' but for 'equality[63].'

(3) But perhaps the third fundamental maxim, on

[63] "Ολως, τὸ ἴσον ζητοῦντες στασιάζουσιν . . Τὸ δὲ ἁπλῶς, πάντῃ, καθ' ἑκατέραν, τετάχθαι τὴν ἰσότητα—φαῦλον. Φανερὸν δ' ἐκ τοῦ συμβαίνοντος· οὐδεμία γὰρ μόνιμος ἐκ τῶν τοιούτων πολιτειῶν. (Arist. *Polit.* v. I. 11.) 'Hence they pleaded then (1570), as others do at this day (1689), for the people's right to choose their own pastors. . . Hence they railed against the pomp and greatness of the clergy,—which is always a popular theme; and so would the exposing of the *inequality* of men's estates be.' (Stillingfleet, *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 25.)

which the Independent system rests, is more tenable than the other two. And although Englishmen on the whole are likely, as intelligence and education increase, to display a very active antipathy to its ecclesiastical and political principles, it may be that the *religious* and theological basis on which it takes its stand, is such as to command an assent, (however unwillingly accorded,) and to compel all thoughtful and serious minds to an unconditional surrender. Let us see then what this theological groundwork of Independency really is. We are to embrace Congregationalism, it seems,—I quote once more from writers of that communion,—because 'the institutions adopted by the primitive Church and recorded *in Scripture* are obligatory on Christians of all ages, . . no variations in different ages and countries affording any ground for introducing modifications in the system[64].'

Yes, we now know precisely where we are. We have met with this absolutely astounding proposition before. But it was amid the confusion and darkness of three hundred years ago. It was amid the first struggles of the Reformation, when men eagerly caught at any theory, however imperfect, which would save them from Popery; and when, amid the insurrection of the laity against a corrupted hierarchy, numberless wild and irrational schemes were broached, which have since been slain a hundred times in open conflict, but still survive in attenuated form among the traditions of narrow communities where the fresh air and light of modern Christendom have never yet found full admission.

---

[64] *Religious Republics*, p. 3. (Cf. 17, 29, and passim: Miall, *Brit.* Wiclif, *Trialogus*, i. 9: Cardwell, *Churches*, p. 411: *Ecclesia*, p. 484· *Conf.* p. 4: Vaughan, *Eng. Nonc.* Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 442: &c.)

What!—we ask in amazement—is the Gospel in the hands of Christians, and of those Christians especially who make the loudest pretensions to intelligence and freedom, to be discharged of all its freedom and to become petrified into a sort of Jewish Law? Are we to stand by and see without a protest the New Testament, —with its express claims to be instinct with *principles*, not rules, and to enkindle men by a living *spirit* instead of binding them by dead statutes,—treated by men who occupy the place of teachers just as the Rabbis treated the Old Testament, and thereby converted it into a Talmud? Nay, do these men really know what they say? Do they mean, e.g., to bind us, for all time, to the use of the primitive love-feast, to a literal community of goods, to the promiscuous kiss of peace, to the regular hour-services of prayer, to the frequent attendance at a great endowed sacrificial service, to the Lord's Supper in private chambers, to baptism by immersion, and above all to the exclusive use of the Old Testament as Holy Scripture? Has the Church of Christ no power whatever to alter or adapt anything? Nay, do the Congregationalists themselves conform to all these things?

We know that they do not. But then we decisively refuse to listen to them, when they stand forth and preach to the world a system, which breaks down at the very first attempt to reduce it honestly to practice. We smile, when they pretend to be in the van of modern thought and modern progress, and are found to be in the rear. We turn away, when the claims of their Church-polity are discovered to be based on a view of Holy Scripture so strangely unintelligent, so profoundly superstitious, so certainly at variance with all the conclusions of modern criticism and modern science, and so

surely condemned to a speedy interment among the dead things of the past, that any one who assails therewith the well-tried polity and free theology of the Church, can only be compared to a naked savage, with his arrows and his canoe, advancing against an iron-clad man-of-war.

But, at the same time, I cannot refrain from saying what I think—at this moment especially—every Churchman is bound to say to his Independent fellow-Christians and fellow-countrymen. It is this. If we meet you—as you would wish us to do—in fair and open conflict as to the claims of your Church system to universal reception, if we remain absolutely unconvinced by your arguments, and are determined (by God's help) to resist to the utmost your attempts to dissever Church and State, —attempts whose success would be far more ruinous to yourselves than to us,—far be it from us, meanwhile, to withhold the tribute of our praise from men of your communion, who have in bygone times withstood, for conscience sake, the tyranny and violence of evil rulers, and have helped to give our country the freedom she enjoys. An over-submissiveness is certainly a great evil. And on this *political* field, the blood of many an Independent and Puritan was not shed in vain. Nor does any intelligent Churchman (I believe) now desire for one moment to narrow the common area that has been cleared, where one Englishmen may meet another with honourable friendship or with courteous rivalry; or refuse to recognize science, literature, commerce, politics, art, as arenas open to all, and where religious discord need not, and ought not, to enter.

Nay, more than this: even in the *ecclesiastical* sphere, I believe no Churchman now-a-days withholds a just encomium from the Congregationalist members of our

common Christendom, for the missionary work that they have done (with other Dissenting bodies) in the dark places of this country, as well as in foreign lands. Partly, no doubt, from her own negligence, but far more (as every honest man will now confess) from the sudden and enormous increase of the population during the present century, the National Church has been utterly unable to overtake the arrears of her work. And Independents,—however crippled by a system which is not found to flourish well among the poor,—have nobly done what in them lay to supplement her agency.

But I will not stop even here. I would fain go much farther than that; and would point out to Churchmen at least,—and, if I might be permitted to do so, to Congregationalists also,—that the very truths which they have most conspicuously emblazoned upon their banner, *are simply an essential part of the acknowledged teaching of the Church of England*[65]. 'The ecclesiastical rights of

[65] It would be difficult to find anywhere a more edifying or interesting series of papers, on subjects connected with religion and the Church, than (so far as the present writer has seen them) those which are written by various Independent ministers, and attached annually to the *Congregational Year-Book*. It would be equally difficult to point out an abler or truer series of essays on ecclesiastical matters, than those contained in the work entitled *Ecclesia*. But then the spirit, the tone, almost the wording of these papers are such as any English Churchman might have used. Would to God, that Independents would ask themselves candidly and dispassionately: (1) What *essential* difference there is between a 'Congregational Union of England,' with subordinate 'County Unions,'—and a 'Church of England,' with subordinate 'Dioceses.' (2) Between a 'declaration of faith, order, and discipline,' in thirty-three articles,—and a similar 'declaration' in thirty-nine articles. (3) Between 'the obligation of Church to Church,' because 'the Churches in Apostolic days recognized their inter-dependence,' (*Year-Book*, 1871, p. 68)—and the diocesan scheme of congregational inter-dependence within the Church of England. (4) Between 'the custom for especially the better-known among our ministers to annually spend some weeks in visiting the churches generally,' (*ibid.* p. 120)—and the Church's system of Episcopal and Archidiaconal visitations. (5) Between the statement, that 'the outcry against all dogma, which is so loud and common in our time, tells disastrously on our religious life,' (*ibid.* p. 92)—and the state-

the laity,' and 'the urgent need of guarding Christendom against secular corruptions from without'—where are these two maxims more clearly enunciated, or more energetically acted on at the present day, than within the National Church? No one can honestly doubt, that this fact is in some measure owing to Congregationalist influence. But at the same time, it is equally certain that while these small private religious bodies,—holding such fragments of the truth as their own specialties, and carrying them apart as 'banners,'—magnify them out of all due and healthful proportion, the Church, (on the other hand,) holds them with a far broader and more statesman-like freedom. For she balances them carefully by many other compensating truths, and so keeps them in due subordination to the true 'analogy of the faith.'

And as for Voluntaryism, Disestablishment, and the other nostrums of the day,—her one sufficient answer is this: *they have all been tried already, under the guidance of one of the greatest statesmen whom England has ever produced*[66],—*and they have signally failed.*

---

ment, that certain 'creeds ought to be received and believed,' and taught as rudimentary long-tried forms of dogma. (6) Between the discovery, that 'there is nothing in our ecclesiastical systems'—in spite of the internecine hostilities amid which they arose—'to prevent fraternal co-operation,' (*ibid.* p. 126)—and the Church's earnest pleading, that such things (being of human, and not divine, obligation) should not prevent conformity and organic union; for 'the spirit of singularity in a few ought to give place unto public judgment,' (Hooker, iv. 13. 7.) (7) Between a 'Union, which has been able indirectly to command an influence over the weaker churches in the election of their ministers,' and thereby 'has prevented many an imprudence,' (*Year-Book*, p. 119) —and the Church's system of patronage, which has (on the whole) worked wonderfully well, and also 'prevented many an imprudence'?

[66] The results of the 'liberation' effected by the Independents in the seventeenth century, even under Cromwell's strong rule, were these: A hundred sects were tearing each other to pieces in every corner of the country; the Baptists wrote threatening letters to him from the army; the Fifth-monarchy men were preparing to be rid of his and every

In America the experiment may possibly have been more successful. But then England is a very different country from America: although some people fail to see the difference[67]. While, of destruction, revolution, separation, disunion, surely the world has of late years seen more than enough. Nay, the very Dissenting periodicals[68] themselves are full of those calls to

---

other human government; the Quakers penetrated into his apartments at Whitehall, and taking the cap from his head tore it in pieces 'as a sign;' and this great man confessed,—after experience of governing a nation where the fountains of the great deep had all been broken up, where the first principles of all things, sacred and profane, were brought under perpetual discussion, and 'scattering, division, and confusion came upon us like things that we desired,—these, which are the greatest plagues that God ordinarily lays upon nations for sin,'—that 'he would rather keep a flock of sheep.' (Carlyle, *Cromwell*, ii. 280, 302.)

[67] The interest of the magnificent problem, which is now being slowly worked out before our eyes by 'the logic of events,' is immensely enhanced by the fact that England and America—essentially and at bottom one race—have each to work out their share of the problem under totally dissimilar conditions. England is an old country, with all the immense advantages and disadvantages of a history reading back thirteen hundred years: America is a new country. England is a small and crowded island: America is a vast, and thinly peopled continent. In England, the main features of the country, social, commercial, and political, have long ago been fixed and have become over-rigid; so that 'one sees in their stolid looks and incurious minds a fatal hopelessness, the natural result of a fixed and limited destiny.' (Tuckerman, *Month in England*, 1854, p. 118.) In America, everything is over-fluid and changing. The very capital of the country will, in another generation, probably be transferred to St. Louis. (Bell, *North Amer.* i. 6.) In England, there exist a wonderful variety and inter-dependence of classes: in America, 'one of the most marked peculiarities is, the total absence of all classes higher than the merchant and the professional man.' (Zincke, *Winter in U. S.* 1868, p. 174.) In England, the 'masses' are town-artisans: in America, the 'masses' are yeoman-farmers: 'all the way from Philadelphia to Baltimore, I found the country *sown* with houses. This arises from the fact that every 100 or 150 acres belongs to a separate proprietor.' (*Ibid.* p. 31.) When therefore Mr. Miall, in his great speech on May 9, 1871, advises the House of Commons to '*look* at the United States of America!' we can desire nothing better than to accentuate that advice.

[68] E.g. *The Methodist New Connexion Magazine*, for April, 1870, p. 241. 'There are everywhere just now among the different sections of the Christian Church, yearnings after Christian union. In England, Scotland, Australia, and America, different sections of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, are seeking closer fellowship with their kindred sections.'

peace and amalgamation, to combined rather than independent efforts, to subordination, harmony, and (on the small scale) reunion, which are—if anything in this world is—the first breath of returning spring upon the Church, a re-awakening of brotherly love and Christian charity among men, and a response on man's part to the gracious pleadings of the Holy Ghost, preparing the way for quite another epoch than that of hatred and watchful jealousy among Christians,—and whispering, 'Sirs, ye are brethren: why do ye wrong one to another?'

# APPENDIX B.

## *The Presbyterian 'Confession of Faith.'*

[The following are the most interesting points in the celebrated 'Westminster Confession of Faith.' It was drawn up by the Assembly of Divines, who were appointed by Parliament, in 1643, to organize the new Presbyterian 'Establishment.' These thirty-three articles are subscribed to, at the present day, by all ministers of the Scotch Presbyterian 'Established Church.']

### I. *Of the Holy Scripture.*

. . 'It pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal Himself and to declare His will unto His Church; and afterwards . . to commit the same wholly unto writing . . Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament . . All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life . . The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not on the testimony of any man or Church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof. And therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God. . . Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness, by and with the Word, in our hearts . . Nothing is at any time to be added —whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men . . The Church is finally to appeal to them . . The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.' . .

### II. *Of God, and of the Holy Trinity.*

### III. *Of God's Eternal Decree.*

'God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass. Yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin or is violence offered to the will of the creatures . . By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, . . but the elect only. The rest of mankind God was pleased . . to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath.' . .

IV. *Of Creation.*

V. *Of Providence.*

VI. *Of the Fall of Man, &c.*

'Our first parents . . so became dead in sin and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed, to all their posterity . . whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil.' . .

VII. *Of God's Covenant with Man.*

VIII. *Of Christ the Mediator.*

IX. *Of Free-Will.*

. . 'Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good . . When God converts a sinner and translates him into the state of grace, He freeth him from his natural bondage under sin; and by His grace alone enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good.' . .

X. *Of Effectual Calling.*

'All those whom God hath predestinated unto life—and those only—He is pleased, in His appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by His Word and Spirit . . not from anything foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein . . Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, where, and how He pleaseth.' . .

XI. *Of Justification.*

'Those whom God effectually calleth, He also freely justifieth . . by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them . . They are not justified, until the Holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them . . Although they can never fall from the state of justification, yet they may by their sins fall under God's fatherly displeasure.' . .

XII. *Of Adoption.*

XIII. *Of Sanctification.*

XIV. *Of Saving Faith.*

XV. *Of Repentance unto Life.*

XVI. *Of Good Works.*

'Good works are only such as God hath commanded in His holy Word, —and not such as, without the warrant thereof, are devised by men out of

blind zeal or upon any pretence of good intention . . Works done by unregenerate men,—although, for the matter of them, they may be things which God commands . . are sinful and cannot please God . . And yet their neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing unto God.'

XVII. *Of the Perseverance of the Saints.*

'They whom God hath accepted . . can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end and be eternally saved.'. .

XVIII. *Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation.*

. . 'This certainly is not a bare conjecture and probable persuasion grounded upon fallible hope, but an infallible assurance of faith,—founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation, the inward evidence of those graces unto which the promises are made, the testimony of the spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits.' . .

XIX. *Of the Law of God.*

'God gave to Adam a law. . . This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness, and as such was delivered by God on Mount Sinai in ten commandments . . Besides this law—commonly called Moral—God was pleased to give to the people of Israel ceremonial laws . . The Moral law doth for ever bind all.' . .

XX. *Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience.*

. . 'God alone is Lord of the conscience; and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to His Word,—or beside it, if matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines or to obey such commands out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience . . For their publishing of such opinions or maintaining of such practices as . . are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the Church, they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against by the censures of the Church and by the power of the civil magistrate.'

XXI. *Of Religious Worship, and the Sabbath Day.*

. . 'God, in His Word,—by a positive, moral, and perpetual command, binding all men in all ages,—hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath.'. .

XXII. *Of Lawful Oaths and Vows.*

XXIII. *Of the Civil Magistrate.*

. . 'It is his duty to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the

Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented and reformed, and all ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God.'. .

XXIV. *Of Marriage and Divorce.*

XXV. *Of the Church.*

'The Catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect . . The visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel, consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children . . This Catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible: and particular Churches,—which are members thereof,—are more or less pure . . The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error . . There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God.'

XXVI. *Of the Communion of Saints.*

XXVII. *Of the Sacraments.*

XXVIII. *Of Baptism.*

. . 'Not only those that do actually profess faith and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents, are to be baptized . . Grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to it, as that . . all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.'. .

XXIX. *Of the Lord's Supper.*

. . 'In this Sacrament Christ is not offered up to His Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all, . . but only a commemoration . . So that the Popish sacrifice of the mass is most abominably injurious to Christ's one only sacrifice . . All ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table.'. .

XXX. *Of Church Censures.*

XXXI. *Of Synods and Councils.*

XXXII. *Of the State of Men after Death.*

XXXIII. *Of the Last Judgment.*

# APPENDIX C.

## *The Independent 'Declaration of Faith, Church Order, and Discipline*[1].'

The Congregational Churches in England and Wales, frequently called Independent, hold the following doctrines, as of Divine authority, and as the foundation of Christian faith and practice. They are also formed and governed according to the principles hereinafter stated.

### Preliminary Notes.

1. It is not designed, in the following summary, to do more than to state the leading doctrines of faith and order maintained by Congregational Churches in general.

2. It is not proposed to offer any proofs, reasons, or arguments, in support of the doctrines herein stated, but simply to declare what the Denomination believes to be taught by the pen of inspiration.

3. It is not intended to present a scholastic or critical confession of faith, but merely such a statement as any intelligent member of the body might offer, as containing its leading principles.

4. It is not intended that the following statement should be put forth with any authority, or as a standard to which assent should be required.

5. Disallowing the utility of creeds and articles of religion as a bond of union, and protesting against subscription to any human formularies as a term of communion, Congregationalists are yet willing to declare, for general information, what is commonly believed among them, reserving to every one the most perfect liberty of conscience.

6. Upon some minor points of doctrine and practice, they, differing among themselves, allow to each other the right to form an unbiassed judgment of the Word of God.

7. They wish it to be observed, that, notwithstanding their jealousy of subscription to creeds and articles, and their disapproval of the imposition of any human standard, whether of faith or discipline, they are far more agreed in their doctrines and practices than any Church which enjoins subscription, and enforces a human standard of orthodoxy; and they believe that there is no minister and no Church among them that would deny the substance of any one of the following doctrines of religion, though each might prefer to state his sentiments in his own way.

---

[1] Transcribed from the *Congregational Year-Book*, 1871.

## PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION.

I. The Scriptures of the Old Testament, as received by the Jews, and the books of the New Testament, as received by the Primitive Christians from the Evangelists and Apostles, Congregational Churches believe to be Divinely inspired, and of supreme authority. These writings, in the languages in which they were originally composed, are to be consulted, by the aids of sound criticism, as a final appeal in all controversies; but the common version they consider to be adequate to the ordinary purposes of Christian instruction and edification.

II. They believe in One God, essentially wise, holy, just, and good; eternal, infinite, and immutable in all natural and moral perfections; the Creator, Supporter, and Governor of all beings, and of all things.

III. They believe that God is revealed in the Scriptures, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that to each are attributable the same Divine properties and perfections. The doctrine of the Divine existence, as above stated, they cordially believe, without attempting fully to explain.

IV. They believe that man was created after the Divine image, sinless, and, in his kind, perfect.

V. They believe that the first man disobeyed the Divine command, fell from his state of innocence and purity, and involved all his posterity in the consequences of that fall.

VI. They believe that, therefore, all mankind are born in sin, and that a fatal inclination to moral evil, utterly incurable by human means, is inherent in every descendant of Adam.

VII. They believe that God having, before the foundation of the world, designed to redeem fallen man, made disclosures of His mercy, which were the grounds of faith and hope from the earliest ages.

VIII. They believe that God revealed more fully to Abraham the covenant of His grace, and, having promised that from his descendants should arise the Deliverer and Redeemer of mankind, set that patriarch and his posterity apart, as a race specially favoured and separated to His service; a peculiar Church, formed and carefully preserved, under the Divine sanction and government, until the birth of the promised Messiah.

IX. They believe that, in the fulness of the time, the Son of God was manifested in the flesh, being born of the Virgin Mary, but conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit; and that our Lord Jesus Christ was both

the Son of man, and the Son of God; partaking fully and truly of human nature, though without sin,—equal with the Father, and 'the express image of His person.'

X. They believe that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, revealed, either personally in His own ministry, or by the Holy Spirit in the ministry of His Apostles, the whole mind of God, for our salvation; and that, by His obedience to the Divine law while He lived, and by His sufferings unto death, He meritoriously 'obtained eternal redemption for us;' having thereby vindicated and illustrated Divine justice, 'magnified the law,' and 'brought in everlasting righteousness.'

XI. They believe that, after His death and resurrection, He ascended up into heaven, where, as the Mediator, He 'ever liveth' to rule over all, and to 'make intercession for them that come unto God by Him.'

XII. They believe that the Holy Spirit is given, in consequence of Christ's mediation, to quicken and renew the hearts of men; and that His influence is indispensably necessary to bring a sinner to true repentance, to produce saving faith, to regenerate the heart, and to perfect our sanctification.

XIII. They believe that we are justified through faith in Christ, as 'The Lord our righteousness;' and not 'by the works of the law.'

XIV. They believe that all who will be saved were the objects of God's eternal and electing love, and were given by an act of Divine sovereignty to the Son of God; which in no way interferes with the system of means, nor with the grounds of human responsibility; being wholly unrevealed as to its objects, and not a rule of human duty.

XV. They believe that the Scriptures teach the final perseverance of all true believers to a state of eternal blessedness, which they are appointed to obtain through constant faith in Christ, and uniform obedience to His commands.

XVI. They believe that a holy life will be the necessary effect of a true faith, and that good works are the certain fruits of a vital union to Christ.

XVII. They believe that the sanctification of true Christians, or their growth in the graces of the Spirit, and meetness for heaven, is gradually carried on through the whole period during which it pleases God to continue them in the present life; and that, at death, their souls, perfectly freed from all remains of evil, are immediately received into the presence of Christ.

XVIII. They believe in the perpetual obligation of Baptism and the

Lord's Supper: the former to be administered to all converts to Christianity and their children, by the application of water to the subject, 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' and the latter to be celebrated by Christian Churches as a token of faith in the Saviour, and of brotherly love.

XIX. They believe that Christ will finally come to judge the whole human race, according to their works; that the bodies of the dead will be raised again; and that, as the Supreme Judge, He will divide the righteous from the wicked, will receive the righteous into 'life everlasting,' but send away the wicked into 'everlasting punishment.'

XX. They believe that Jesus Christ directed His followers to live together in Christian fellowship, and to maintain the communion of saints; and that, for this purpose, they are jointly to observe all Divine ordinances, and maintain that Church order and discipline, which is either expressly enjoined by inspired institution, or sanctioned by the undoubted example of the Apostles and of Apostolic Churches.

## PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

I. The Congregational Churches hold it to be the will of Christ that true believers should voluntarily assemble together to observe religious ordinances, to promote mutual edification and holiness, to perpetuate and propagate the Gospel in the world, and to advance the glory and worship of God, through Jesus Christ; and that each society of believers, having these objects in view in its formation, is properly a Christian Church.

II. They believe that the New Testament contains, either in the form of express statute, or in the example and practice of Apostles and Apostolic Churches, all the articles of faith necessary to be believed, and all the principles of order and discipline requisite for constituting and governing Christian societies; and that human traditions, fathers and councils, canons and creeds, possess no authority over the faith and practice of Christians.

III. They acknowledge Christ as the only Head of the Church, and the officers of each Church under Him, as ordained to administer His laws impartially to all; and their only appeal, in all questions touching their religious faith and practice, is to the Sacred Scriptures.

IV. They believe that the New Testament authorizes every Christian Church to elect its own officers, to manage all its own affairs, and to stand independent of, and irresponsible to, all authority, saving that only of the Supreme and Divine Head of the Church, the Lord Jesus Christ.

V. They believe that the only officers placed by the Apostles over individual Churches are the bishops or pastors, and the deacons; the number of these being dependent upon the numbers of the Church; and that to these, as the officers of the Church, is committed respectively the administration of its spiritual and temporal concerns—subject, however, to the approbation of the Church.

VI. They believe that no persons should be received as members of Christian Churches, but such as make a credible profession of Christianity, are living according to its precepts, and attest a willingness to be subject to its discipline; and that none should be excluded from the fellowship of the Church, but such as deny the faith of Christ, violate His laws, or refuse to submit themselves to the discipline which the Word of God enforces.

VII. The power of admission into any Christian Church, and rejection from it, they believe to be vested in the Church itself, and to be exercised only through the medium of its own officers.

VIII. They believe that Christian Churches should statedly meet for the celebration of public worship, for the observance of the Lord's Supper, and for the sanctification of the first day of the week.

IX. They believe that the power of a Christian Church is purely spiritual, and should in no way be corrupted by union with temporal or civil power.

X. They believe that it is the duty of Christian Churches to hold communion with each other, to entertain an enlarged affection for each other, as members of the same body, and to co-operate for the promotion of the Christian cause; but that no Church, nor union of Churches, has any right or power to interfere with the faith or discipline of any other Church, further than to separate from such as, in faith or practice, depart from the Gospel of Christ.

XI. They believe that it is the privilege and duty of every Church to call forth such of its members as may appear to be qualified, by the Holy Spirit, to sustain the office of the ministry; and that Christian Churches unitedly ought to consider the maintenance of the Christian ministry in an adequate degree of learning, as one of its especial cares; that the cause of the Gospel may be both honourably sustained, and constantly promoted.

XII. They believe that Church officers, whether bishops or deacons, should be chosen by the free voice of the Church; but that their dedication to the duties of their office should take place with special prayer, and by solemn designation, to which most of the Churches add the imposition of hands by those already in office.

XIII. They believe that the fellowship of every Christian Church should be so liberal as to admit to communion in the Lord's Supper all whose faith and godliness are, on the whole, undoubted, though conscientiously differing in points of minor importance; and that this outward sign of fraternity in Christ should be co-extensive with the fraternity itself, though without involving any compliances which conscience would deem to be sinful.

Note - Liberality !!!

# LECTURE III.

## THE ROMANISTS.

A.D. 1570.

*Leading Idea*:—The organic Unity of the Church.

*Method adopted*:—Concentration of the Ecclesiastical Polity into a despotism.

'Quisquis se Universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione suâ Antichristum præcurrit.' (Pope Gregory I. *Epist.* vii. 33.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

*c.* 200. First symptoms of Papal pride (Pope Victor).

*c.* 400. Rights of Patriarchs overridden:

- 347. Council of Sardica gives appeals to Julius I.
- 402. Innocent I. interferes at Constantinople.
- 445. Leo I. (in Peter's name) claims the whole Church.
- 680. Agatho, entitled 'Universalis Patriarcha.'
- 863. Nicholas I. deposes Photius.
- 1054. Leo IX. excommunicates the Eastern Church.
- 1203. Innocent III. (fourth Crusade) captures Constantinople.

*c.* 500. Rights of Metropolitans overridden:

- 417. Zosimus interferes in Africa.
- 498. Symmachus begins to send the pallium.
- 600. Gregory I. places Augustin over the British Church.
- 752. Zachary sends 'legates à latere.'
- 840. Forged decretals composed.
- 860. Nicholas I. tramples on Archbishops of Rheims, &c.
- 1061. Alexander II. claims to confirm all Bishops.
- 1070. — deposes Archbishop Stigand.
- 1140. 'Decretum Gratiani,' &c.

*c.* 1000. Rights of Bishops overridden:

- 1066. Monasteries exempted.
- 1155. Bishops robbed of patronage by 'mandates.'

*c.* 1050. Rights of Presbyters overridden:

- 1050. Leo IX. imposes celibacy.
- 1150. Bishops chosen by Cathedral Chapters.
- 1199. Innocent III. begins to tax the clergy.
- 1216. Friars sent out into the parishes.

*c.* 1100. Rights of the Laity overridden:

- 1050. Interdicts begin.
- 1059. Popes elected by Cardinals only.
- 1076. Gregory VII. deposes the German Emperor.
- 1100. Laity excluded from electing Bishops.
- 1158. Adrian IV. grants away Ireland, &c.

1170. Lay tribunals forbidden to try Clergy.
1200. Innocent III. makes kings his 'vassals.'
1266. Clement IV. deprives lay-patrons.
1300. Boniface VIII. claims universal dominion.

c. 1200. Rights of General Councils overridden:
384. Siricius annuls a Canon of Nicæa.
440. Leo I. annuls a Canon of Chalcedon.
1200. Innocent III. claims a general dispensing power.
1409. Councils (Pisa, Constance, Basle) nullified by the Popes.

1300. Culmination of the Papal pretensions in Boniface VIII.

1303. Resistance begins in earnest:
1279. English 'Statute of Mortmain.'
1303. Philip IV. of France burns the Pope's Bull, and appeals to a General Council.
1305. — transfers the Pope to France.
1350. English 'Statute of Provisors.'
1366. English Parliament refuses Papal tribute.
1389. English 'Statute of Præmunire.'
1409. Councils of Pisa, Constance, Basle.
1438. 'Pragmatic sanction' of Charles VII.
1520. Luther in Germany burns the Pope's Bull, and appeals to a General Council.
1530. Church of England renounces the Papal supremacy, and appeals to a General Council.
1588. Spanish Armada repelled.
1688. James II. expelled, and the throne barred in future to a Romanist.

1530. England throws off the Papal supremacy.
1543. The Jesuits sanctioned by the Pope.
1545. Latin Council at Trent.
1564. Cassander's effort at reunion.
1569. Seminary for English priests founded at Douai.

---

1570. Pius V. issues his Bull against Queen Elizabeth.
1572. Massacre of St. Bartholomew in France.
1587. Plots to assassinate Elizabeth, and set Mary Queen of Scots on the throne. Mary beheaded.
1588. England attacked by the Spanish Armada.
1598. Pope commissions an Archpriest to govern the English Romanists.
1605 Gunpowder plot, Oates's plot, &c.

1623. Pope commissions titular Bishops (in partibus) to govern as his Vicars-Apostolic.
1658. Bishop Forbes's effort at reunion.
1689. Romanists excluded from the Toleration Act.
1718. Archbishop Wake's effort at reunion.
1829. Romanists admitted to Parliament, &c.
1851. Schismatic Hierarchy nominated by the Pope.
1854. Immaculate Conception of Blessed Virgin Mary added to the Creed.
1865. Dr. Pusey's effort at reunion.
1870. Latin Council at the Vatican; Papal Infallibility added to the Creed.
1871. Protest of Dr. Döllinger and the South German Church.

# LECTURE III.

## THE ROMANISTS.

'Neither as being lords over God's heritage; but being ensamples to the flock.'—1 *Peter* v. 3.

THE second great secession which rent the unity and disturbed the peace of the Church of England, subsequently to the Reformation, was that of the Romanists. Amid all the ecclesiastical changes of Henry the Eighth's reign, and during the minority of Edward VI., no schism had taken place. Queen Mary's reactionary policy had, no doubt, encouraged many to revert to the scholastic doctrines and superstitious ceremonies to which they had been accustomed in their youth. Yet, even then, on Elizabeth's accession there was little thought of forsaking and anathematizing their mother church. Out of 9,400 priests then in England, less than 200 protested against all change so far as to abandon their posts[1]. Such conduct was reserved for a later period; when a disgraceful Bull from Pius V., in 1570, compelled men to choose between allegiance to their own Church, and allegiance to the great (so-called)

[1] Stoughton, *Church of the Civil Wars*, i. 8.

'centre of unity' and sole 'Vicar of Jesus Christ,'—the Bishop of Rome. And from that time forward, especially during the next eighteen years, a considerable secession certainly took place. Till, at length, the death of the Queen of Scots in 1587, and the failure of the Spanish Armada in 1588, dispelled many illusions; and caused a great number of recusants to conform once more to the National Church[2].

The question on which these Romanists seceded,—and thus followed the evil example set them by the Brownists and Independents shortly before,—was once more a question of external organization. They too, like the Independents, went off on a point of ecclesiastical polity,—only in the opposite direction. They too imagined they were obeying Christ's behests in breaking up the framework of His Church in these realms. And just as the Independents persuaded themselves that a democracy (or, more strictly speaking, an oligarchy,) was the sole divinely-appointed arrangement for Christendom, so the Romanists persuaded themselves, on the other hand, that a *despotism* was the only divinely-ordered Christian polity; and that whatever the Autocrat of the Church—Christ's supposed Vicegerent—should order them to do, that as a matter of conscience they must do.

They are not now numerically very strong in England. It has recently been calculated that the whole number of really English-born Romanists does not exceed 180,000 persons: while even the Baptists number 700,000, and the Congregationalists claim 1,000,000 adherents[3]. Nor are they increasing nearly so much as some people appear to imagine. It is mainly their

[2] Froude, xii. 531. [3] Ravenstein, *Denominational Statistics*, p. 24.

chapels and monastic buildings that increase. And these do not necessarily represent any great number of English converts; nor are they necessarily either built or maintained wholly by English money[4].

It is clear, then, that the great pressure they are able to exert upon political and ecclesiastical affairs in this country is due, mainly, to their enormous preponderance in Ireland, to the strangely passive obedience which their clergy succeed in exacting from their flocks, and to their intimate connexion with an immense mass of sympathizers in other parts of the world. And thus it comes to pass that the alienation of this small body from the National Church is a real calamity. And, inasmuch as there is no 'dissent upon principle' here, no objection whatever to a close alliance between Church and State, and not nearly so much *essential* divergence—either in doctrine or practice—from the Church of England, as is popularly imagined[5], it becomes a very interesting question to ask, 'How then did the secession take place? And on what grounds is it now so disastrously, yet so persistently, maintained?'

The answer to these questions is at once very clear

---

[4] In 1854, the Romanists were 4.94 per cent. of the whole population: in 1866, they were only 4.63 per cent. They have now one chapel to every 970 persons. (Ravenstein, *Denominational Statistics*, p. 24.)

[5] This has been well shown by Dr. Pusey in his *Eirenicon* (1865, &c.), and by Dr. Lingard, *Hist of Engl.* vi. 332. And yet, on the other hand, such profound gulfs sometimes open between the Roman and Anglican views, not merely upon religion, but upon the very στοιχεῖα of common morality, that one is forced (almost involuntarily) to concur in Dr. Newman's opinion, that Roman 'Catholics and Protestants, viewed as bodies, hold nothing in common in religion,—however they may seem to do so.' (*On Univ. Educ.* p. 155.) What notion of 'morality,' e. g.,—beyond the merely sexual sphere,—can a writer possess, who thus speaks of poor bloodstained, ungovernable Ireland? 'To this day, among the nations of the Christian world, there is not to be found a people so . . . governed by *Christian morality*, as the people of Ireland.' (Abp. Manning, *The Four great Evils of the Day* [1871], p. 132.)

and very brief. For though a vast accumulation of controversial literature has grown up round this subject, and it might therefore easily be imagined that no human brain is equal to the task of weighing the arguments that can be adduced on either side, nor an ordinary lifetime long enough for arriving at tranquil certitude about the matter,—this would be in reality a great mistake. In controversy—as in every other sort of conflict—whatever be the extent of country over which it may range, and however intricate its combinations may appear, there is always some one central spot which forms the *key to the whole position.* And this point once mastered, this key once gained, the whole field is found to be dominated; and many an enormous outwork and laborious entrenchment become at once entirely useless.

Now this is remarkably the case with the Romanist controversy. For join issue on whatever subject you will, begin from any outlying part of the broad field of theology that you or your antagonist may please, the course of argument will be sure to bring you at last always to the one central question, which forms the key and focus of the whole matter,—and that is, the question of the ecclesiastical supremacy—or rather, as we must now say, the absolute and unlimited despotism—of the Pope[7].

[7] Driven from every other point of advantage against the English Church, by the increase of light and spread of knowledge,—finding her orders acknowledged as genuine by men like Courayer, Du Pin, and Dr. Lingard; her Liturgy offered express ratification by Pope Pius IV.; her primate called a 'Patriarch' by Reyner, and even 'alterius orbis Papa' by Pope Adrian; her provincial councils such, as are admitted by Canonists like Lancelot to supply 'sæpissimè' good legislation for the whole Church to accept; her grandeur, and magnificent history conceded by Dr. Newman;—Romanists are now-a-days, more than ever, taking refuge in this last desperate stronghold, viz. the absolute necessity to the existence of any Church on earth, that its clergy should hold their 'mission' from the Pope. 'Though we were to admit of an apostolical

Suppose, for instance, you begin with the question of Transubstantiation. No sensible man can argue for ten minutes on this subject, without discovering that—if this theory about the precise *mode* of Christ's presence in the Eucharist have any meaning at all, and be not (as some have ventured to say) a mere hard answer given to amuse people who will persist in asking hard questions—the only meaning it can possibly have is a physical one. The dogma simply stamps as infallibly true the speculations of a heathen philosopher, Aristotle, about the essence (substantia, *οὐσία*,) of bodies,—an essence which none of our senses can reach, but which can only be subjectively cogitated or imagined. But then the question at once arises, what *authority* has stamped this strange notion, of heathen origin, as infallibly true? And the answer given by a Romanist is, 'the authority of the whole Catholic Church, assembled in council, first at Rome in 1215, and afterwards at Trent in 1555.' But how can it be said that the 'whole Church' did this act, when the Greek communion in the one case, and both the Greek and almost all the Teutonic Churches in the other, were absent? It is replied: 'because (as the Lateran Council put it) whatever the Pope does, the Church is reckoned as doing[8]:' or (as Nicolas Sanders tells us Englishmen quite plainly) 'that alone is the true Church, which is in communion with the Roman Pontiff sitting in the seat of Peter[9].' And consequently,

succession of orders in the Established Church, we never could admit of an apostolical succession of mission, jurisdiction, or right to execute those orders.' (Milner, *End of Controv.*, Letter 29.) But we reply by a maxim of the old Canon Law: 'Extrà territorium, impunè non paretur jus-dicenti.'

[8] 'Illud quod Papa facit, etiam Ecclesia dicitur facere, — tanquam ipsius caput universale.' (Fourth Lat. Council, 1215: ap. Bail, i. 435.)

[9] 'Illa sola est vera Christi Ecclesia, quæ communicat cum Pontifice Romano in Cathedrâ Petri sedente.' (Sanders, *De Visibili Monarchiâ* (1592), p. 219.)

Transubstantiation, having the sanction of the *papal* Church, is to be reckoned as having the sanction of the *whole* Church. It is therefore infallibly true. For the whole Church has the Lord's promise of indefectibility, and can never go utterly astray. And so they that hold the dogma false or unproven, are *ipso facto* out of the Church and accursed; because they do not concur with the Pope. And so the PAPAL question, after all, forms the key to this Eucharistic controversy, which seemed at first sight so far removed from it.

Yes, it was this question of the Papacy—might we not almost say, alone and exclusively—which divided us English Churchmen in the sixteenth century, and which divides us still, from the Romanists in our own country, and from the foreign Churches who abet them in their schism. And deep as is our obligation to the earlier and more large-hearted Popes, for invaluable aid in organizing and giving stability to the somewhat loose and shapeless Christianity which we received from the British missionaries, who mainly converted our forefathers [10]; and whatever thanks we owe them, for many a good Church-law and many an improvement in music, ritual, and architecture; still it were not wonderful, if every ancient benefit were totally forgotten and the former loyalty were changed into bitter indignation, in view of what the later King-popes have essayed, not only

[10] This fact has been long industriously kept out of view. But the truth is, that the whole of England north of the Thames owes its Christianity to the missionaries, not of Rome, but of *the ancient British Church*. Essex and East Anglia, though attempted by the Roman party, relapsed into paganism; and were finally converted by Fursey and Cedde (S. Chad's brother): Northumbria was Christianized by Aidan: Mercia by Aidan's scholars, Diuma, Chad, &c. It was on Chad's head, at his consecration as Bishop of Lichfield A.D. 644, that the two lines of episcopal succession (British and Roman) for the first time converged and united.

against the peace and order of our country, but against the efficiency and spirituality of our Church[11].

A.D. 1300—the year of the great Jubilee at Rome, under Boniface VIII.—may be conveniently marked as the culminating point of the Papal supremacy. And from that point, during three centuries, it gradually declined; passing through (1) the disastrous period of 'seventy years' captivity' at Avignon: (2) the still more disastrous epoch of divided allegiance, when two or three Popes were striving together for the mastery: (3) the shameful half-century of abortive Conciliar reformations (1409—1442): ere it ultimately descended into the lowest depths of degradation and infamy, under Alexander VI. (†1502). How it had grown to that dangerous and toppling height, which it reached under Boniface VIII., is a story too long and too well known to need repeating here. It must suffice to touch the salient

[11] This point has not been sufficiently attended to. Yet surely, if anything is treason within the *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, if anything deserve the name of 'Anti-christian' conduct, it is the fearful sacrilege of perverting the very Church of Christ Himself into a school of inveracity, superstition, covetousness, ambition, and implacable cruelty. These are among the vices which the Church is expressly commissioned to eradicate. Yet it is these very things, which the Papal maxims and conduct, in England as elsewhere, have tended to foster; and which the deplorable worldliness of a Royal-papal system actually hindered the lower clergy from effectually combatting. The following, e. g., are some of the Papal maxims—the maxims of the pretended Vicar of Jesus Christ, and mouthpiece of the Holy Ghost upon earth:—'Juramentum contrà utilitatem ecclesiasticam non tenet.' (Decretal, ii. 24. 27, quoting Innocent III.) 'Rom. Pontifex jura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere.' (Bonif. VIII., ap. Sext. Decret. i. 2. 1.) 'Subesse Romano Pontifici omnem humanam creaturam, declaramus omninò esse de necessitate salutis.' (Bull *unam sanctam*, of Bonif. VIII.) 'Eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi, et ipsi Christo .. Crux Christi est adoranda adoratione latriæ.' (Aquinas, *Summa*, iii. 25. 3: a canonized saint.) 'Sunt hæretici ipso jure excommunicati: item, in filiis dissolvitur patriæ potestatis vinculum; et ipsi filii, fratres, et sorores debent eos deserere: et cum iis dissolvitur conjugalis servitus, et potest fieri separatio à toro.. Item, sunt infames et intestabiles ... Confiscari debent omnia bona eorum.. et hodiè damnandi sunt ad mortem per seculares potestates, et per eos debent comburi.' (Lyndwood, p. 293: Oxf. ed.)

points, and to make the huge masses of historical fact and theological commentary, that encumber in Titanic confusion this whole district, surrender to a side ray the real secret of their conformation.

For though the whole truth about the Papacy is known now, it was not known 300 years ago. And this fact in great measure accounts for and excuses the Romanist secession in England. It was *then* still popularly believed that Christ had left His Church, when He ascended into heaven, organized very nearly on the mediæval system. It was *then* still believed that St. Peter was, in some true sense, a 'Pope;' and that he had presided in his Cathedral at Rome for twenty-five years, seven months, and eight days. He was still clothed, by a childlike imagination, with the attributes of an Innocent III. or a Martin V.,—just as the painters of that period represented Roman centurions in mediæval armour, and conceived the dreary landscapes of Judæa as luxuriant with the beauty of Southern Italy.

And did there not stand too, amid every public and authorized collection of the Church's Canon Laws[12],—

[12] The Canon Law (properly speaking) is, of course, nothing else than the *lex scripta* of that great βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, that true Catholic or 'International' Society, the Christian Church spread throughout the world. But among the thousand inaccuracies and confusions which have arisen from the usurpations of Rome, this is one: that the *Pope's* Canon Law has come to supersede the *Church's* Canon Law. Of the latter, as set forth in the enactments of the Church's true legislative organs, the great Œcumenical Councils, the Greek Church has been the most watchful guardian. Though England too may claim her meed of praise; when, amid all the exasperations of the Reformation period, she enacted—not only that 'such *canons and synodals provincial*, being already made, which be not contrariant nor repugnant to the laws, statutes and customs of this realm, nor to the danger or hurt of the King's prerogative, shall now still be used and executed:' (25 Hen. VIII. 19:)—but also that 'Judges ecclesiastical shall not adjudge for "heresy" anything but that which heretofore hath been so adjudged by Scripture,' or by the *first four General Councils*,' &c. (1 Eliz. i. 36.) The fountain-head of the 'Pope's Canon Law,' on the other hand, is to be found in the *Decretum Gratiani* (A.D. 1140)—a strange jum-

by which every archdeacon's and every bishop's court guided their proceedings, and under which the whole daily life of the Church was governed,—a series of canons, letters, quotations from the Fathers, and decrees of Popes, reaching down from the very earliest centuries? And did they not all alike acknowledge the two main facts in dispute: viz. (1) Peter's monarchy over the whole Church, and (2) his transmission of that office to the successive occupants of the Roman See?

What, amid such overpowering proofs, was a modest man to do, who desired to be in communion with the Catholic Church from the beginning, and who believed in the maxim 'quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus'? What was he to reply, when he was shown a passage in a Greek Father, so early and so important as ST. CYRIL of Alexandria in the *fifth* century, to this effect: 'Just as the Son of God received from His Father the government of the Church and of the nations, so that every knee must bow to Him,—so the same ample power did He fully commit to Peter and his successors'? What was he to think, when he found ST. AUGUSTINE, in the *fourth* century, writing, 'Rome hath spoken: the question is settled:' CYPRIAN, in the *third* century, saying: 'How can he believe himself to be in the Church, who forsakes the chair of Peter?' IRENÆUS, in the *second* century, saying: 'It is necessary that all depend upon the Church of Rome, as on a well-spring or a head:' and even ANACLETUS, in the

ble of scraps from the Fathers, shreds from the Councils, and above all of sentences from Papal epistles (both genuine and forged). This, swollen to thrice its original size by subsequent accretions, formed the 'Corpus Juris Canonici,' for the lawyers who practised in the Pope's Chancery. The modern Papal Handbooks breathe a still more concentrated atmosphere of ultramontane absolutism: see, e. g., Lancelot, *Institutiones* (1560), bk. i. tit. 6: Sauter, *Fundamenta* (1809), i. 69: Devotus, *Instit.* (1838), p. 52: Bouix, *Tractatus* (1852), p. 128.

*first* century,—the next but one in succession to St. Peter himself, about A.D. 78,—determining the question plainly thus: 'Let all the more important and difficult cases that may arise be referred to the Apostolic See: for so the apostles decreed, under the express bidding of the Saviour'? How could he feel comfortable, I say, in remaining within his own national Church, when he was shown this consensus of authorities in favour of the Papal supremacy, and yet saw her indignantly shaking off the Papal yoke, which had, on these very grounds, been submitted to by kings and bishops and schoolmen for 1000 years?

Nay, if he still hesitated, he was shown the letters of a whole *series* of Antenicene Popes, all plainly supporting the Papal claims. There were the letters *totidem verbis* of Melchiades, Eusebius, and Marcellus, early in the fourth century: of Felix, Sixtus II., Lucius, Cornelius, Calixtus, Zephyrinus, in the third century: of Victor, in the second century: and of Anacletus, Clement, and even S. Peter himself, in the first century. There were, besides these, the Conciliar decisions at Sinuessa in Italy, A.D. 303, laying it down that 'the first see is to be judged by no man;' and at Nicæa, the great Œcumenical Council in A.D. 325, ordering that 'all episcopal appeals be taken before the Bishop of Rome.' And to clench and settle the whole matter, there stood—in plain and legible characters—upon the page of Gratian's *Decretum*[13], the following words of the great, holy, and intelligent St. Augustine (A.D. 400), placing the decrees of the Popes on the same level of inspiration as the Bible itself; 'The Epistles,' said he, 'issued by the Holy See form part of the Canonical Scriptures.'

I have not even now set before you all the proofs of

[13] Part i. dist. 19. cap. 6.

this kind, which were used to overpower men's judgment and common sense in the sixteenth century. Nay, some of them are still used, are still incorporated in the Breviaries and the books of Canon Law; and are even (with audacious effrontery) pushed to extravagance—in our own land and in the year of grace 1870,—by being carried back yet farther than St. Peter, and attached to the sacred person of our blessed Lord Himself. 'Do you mean,'—writes an English Romanist, only last year,—'that our blessed Lord taught His apostles the immaculate conception of His blessed mother? I do. And the *infallibility of the Pope?* I do[14].' However, enough has been said, I think, to show that, (whatever may be the case in the nineteenth century,) an ordinarily educated clergyman or layman, about the middle of the sixteenth century, might well be excused if he felt in great perplexity about this subject; if he hesitated between these opposite claims to his allegiance; and sometimes decided in favour of obedience to the Pope, in preference to a continued loyalty to his own English mother church.

And now what is the truth of the matter? The truth of the matter is simply this: *the whole of these documents and passages that I have quoted, are now known to be,—and are for the most part acknowledged even by Jesuits and Popes to be,—a series of gross forgeries.* There is not one of them, that has been able to stand the test of inquiry; not one of them, that has not melted away beneath the searching glance of an honest criticism; not one that has escaped the brand of a disgraceful imposture.

Take first the passage from St. Cyril—quoted even by such men as Ferraris, the Canonist, in the eighteenth

[14] *The Barnet Catholic Magazine*, May, 1870, p. 6.

century[15]; and by Rayner the Dominican, in the seventeenth century[16]. It is expressly acknowledged to be spurious by the Dominican editor of Rayner's book, in 1655. Indeed, a whole 'treasury' of similar forgeries, purporting to represent the submission of the early Greek fathers to the Papal claims, has now been detected and exposed. There is a *Thesaurus Græcorum Patrum*, which is now known to be the work of a forger in the thirteenth century, who brought to Pope Urban IV. a MS., full of fabricated citations, constructed in support of the Papal claims and of the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, against the aspersions of contemporary Greek writers. Urban handed on the MS. to his friend Thomas Aquinas; who was in his turn deceived, and who accepted—though not without some grave suspicions—this gross imposition as a genuine work[17].

Turn next to the peremptory and decisive passage from St. Augustine, a passage employed even to this day—as any one who has had controversy with Romanists can attest—with perfect confidence and triumph: 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est.' *Those words were never written by St. Augustine.* What he did write is as follows: on the Pelagian question, 'the results of two councils were communicated to the Apostolic See, and letters were received in reply. The controversy is at

[15] Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, vii. 26, [second edition, 1780,] a work in great request, especially on Rubrical questions.

[16] Raynerii, *Pantheologia*, iii. 162, [ed. Nicolai, 1655.] It was used as a text-book in most Roman Catholic institutions, till nearly the middle of the last century.

[17] P. de Rubeis, the Dominican, in his dissertation prefixed to Thomas Aquinas' work *Contra errores Græcorum*, confesses that the great Schoolman was deceived by this forgery and made use of it against the Greeks: but thinks that afterwards his suspicions were aroused, and that a certain 'olfacta falsitas' warned him against using the Thesaurus in composing his great work, the *Summa Theologiæ*. (See P. Gratry, 'Deuxième lettre à Mgr. l'archevêque de Malines,' p. 26.)

an end: may the error also, one day, end[18]!' Moreover his personal opinions on this subject can easily be gathered, by a hundred genuine passages culled at random from his voluminous works; by which it appears that,—so far from maintaining the modern Jesuit view of the chief authority in the Church,—he held precisely the Anglican view; viz. that the supreme ecclesiastical power was lodged in a *general council* of the whole Church[19], the Bishop of Rome claiming merely a Primacy among his brother bishops[20]. To which we may venture to add, that his opinion also about 'pious frauds' and convenient forgeries may be gathered from the following passage: 'Omnis qui mentitur, iniquitatem facit; et si cuiquam videtur *utile* aliquando esse mendacium, potest videri utilem esse aliquando iniquitatem[21].'

We come next to St. Cyprian, in the third century. The famous passage in his work *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* (chap. ii.) has been by Romanists 'so often alleged and repeated, that scarce any writer of their side sails in the

---

[18] 'Jam enim de hâc causâ duo concilia missa sunt ad sedem apostolicam: inde etiam rescripta venerunt. Causa finita est; utinam aliquando finiatur error!' (*Serm.* 132, sub fin.; Migne, v. 754: cf. Gratry, ii. 57; Janus, 70.)

[19] 'Nec tale aliquid auderemus asserere, nisi Universæ Ecclesiæ concordissimâ auctoritate firmati. Cui et ipse [Cyprianus] sine dubio cederet, si jam illo tempore quæstionis hujus veritas eliquata et declarata per *plenarium Concilium* solidaretur.' (De Bapt. ix. 2. 5: ap. Gratry, ii. 60.)

[20] '*Communis omnibus nobis* qui fungimur Episcopatus officio—quamvis ipse in eâ præemineas celsiore fastigio—specula pastoralis.' (Ad Bonifacium, contrà duas Epist. Pelagianorum, i. 1. 2.) Cf. Janus, p. 88. 'St. Augustine has written more on the Church, its unity and authority, than all the other Fathers put together. Yet, from his numerous works filling ten folios, only one sentence in one letter can be quoted, where he says that the principality [the "primacy,"—principatus] of the Apostolic chair has always been at Rome... In the seventy-five chapters [of his work on the Unity of the Church] there is not a single word on the necessity of communion with Rome as the centre of unity.'

[21] Augustine, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, i. § 36: cf. *Serm.* 132, cap. 3. 'Eligo ut homo in aliquo fallatur, quam ut in aliquo mentiatur. Falli enim pertinet ad infirmitatem: mentiri ad iniquitatem.'

main ocean of controversies, but he toucheth at this point[22].' Unluckily, *every single word is an interpolation.* 'I have seen,' says Dr. James, first curator of the Bodleian Library (†1629), 'eight very ancient MSS., and can speak of my certain knowledge, that none of these have any such matter[23].'

The passage first appears in a letter from Pelagius II. (†590) to the Istrian Bishops; in order (it would seem) to save the credit of St. Cyprian,—a great saint, who stood too high in popular veneration to be dethroned, although a previous Pope had included his writings in a list of works rejected by the Church. To effect this, it was necessary (1) to interpolate a *pro-papal* passage in the midst of a distinctly *anti-papal* work,—and that, only ten lines below the following passage: 'The other apostles were the same as was Peter, endued with an equal share both of dignity and power;' and only ten lines above the celebrated words: 'Episcopatus unum est; cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur:'—and (2) to alter in his favour the papal list of rejected works. Both these things were done[24]. And in the subsequent Roman edition of 1563, the forgery was retained,—in the face of better knowledge and against the express remonstrances of the editor himself,—by order of the Papal censors. In the Paris edition of 1726, the same disgraceful conduct was repeated. For when the learned editor, Baluze, had erased the forgery, it was restored afresh by order of Cardinal Fleury, 'lest he should

[22] James, *On the Corruptions of the Fathers*, 1611. (Oxford reprint, p. 78.)

[23] *Ibid.* p. 81.

[24] Janus, p. 127. To this Dr. Hergenröther, in his *Anti-Janus*, p. 149, makes the following reply: 'The inserted words are nothing more than the marginal note of a copyist or reader, which afterwards crept into the text.' As regards the spuriousness of the passage then, 'habemus confitentem reum.'

involve himself in a quarrel with Rome.' And to this day, in the ordinary Romanist editions, the false but useful words retain their place[25].

The next citation to be examined, is that from Irenæus, in the second century. It is used by Melchior Canus (1563), by Bellarmine (1586), and by other controversialists, down to St. Liguori (1787),—whose work on *Moral Theology* is in the hands of every Roman priest and seminarist, and who is lauded by an ultramontane archbishop as 'the most powerful echo of tradition in modern times[26].' Will it be credited? *The words are nowhere to be found in St. Irenæus.* They are a pure invention from beginning to end. The only basis on which they can even pretend to stand, is the well-known passage, where Irenæus makes his appeal to Catholic tradition—best preserved, naturally, in the most central, populous, and apostolic Churches—against the heretical novelties of his day. He asks, therefore, as a matter of common sense, why people should go far afield to search for the truth, when it is already to be found deposited in the Church: and whether it were not the more rational course, 'to refer to the most ancient Churches, in which the apostles had been personally present; and from them to draw a clear certainty about the matter in debate[27]?'

---

[25] E.g. in the handy 8vo. edition, Paris, 1836; and in Migne's cheap edition, which is headed *Traditio Catholica*, Paris, 1865: the latter, however, having undertaken to give Baluzius' notes in full, is compelled to reprint the following remarks of an 'eruditionis haud ita sanæ' (!)—'Latinius (1563) ait, hoc additamentum non reperiri in septem codicibus Vaticanis. Ego vidi septem et viginti, in quibus pariter deest... Non habentur in antiquis editionibus, neque in libris nostris antiquis.' Yet in the face of these facts, the passage is used by Baronius, Bellarmine, Stapleton, the Rhemists, and many others; and no doubt does good service in the Papal cause to the present hour.

[26] Mgr. Dechamps. Archbishop of Malines, (Gratry, ii. 21).

[27] 'Nonne oporteret in *antiquissimas* recurrere Ecclesias, in quibus

But 'since it were long,' he says, 'to go through, in a work like this, the successions of bishops in all the Churches,' he will content himself with that 'greatest, most ancient and well-known Church, founded at Rome. For to this Church, on account of its primary importance, the whole Church of the surrounding faithful find themselves drawn together; and so in it, by the concourse of the faithful from all sides, the Apostolic tradition is kept up[28].' (iii. 3. 1.) We observe that in all this there is not one word about the Pope or his mysterious claims. Rather, the reference to the Roman Church at that epoch was as much a matter of simple common sense, as was the precisely similar language of Tertullian[29] and of St. Augustine[30], on the same subject. But garbled in later times, accentuated and interpolated, it was made to do duty by falsely en-

Apostoli conversati sunt,—et ab iis, de præsenti quæstione, sumere quod certum et re liquidum est?' (*Hær.* iii. 4. 1.)

[28] 'Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et *antiquissimæ* et omnibus cognitæ, à gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ ecclesiæ . . . traditionem indicantes, confundimus eos, etc. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem [qu. *διὰ τὴν ἱκανωτέραν ἀρχήν*, or *ἀρχαιότητα*], necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam,—hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles,—in quâ semper, ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.' The passage (as is well known) exists only in a Latin translation. Its meaning is well illustrated by Athenæus, *Deipn.* i. § 36, (ap. Neander, i. 285,) 'Ῥώμη πόλις ἐπιτομὴ τῆς οἰκουμένης,—ἐν ᾗ συνιδεῖν ἐστιν οὕτως πάσας τὰς πόλεις ἱδρυμένας: and by Chrys. *Farewell Oration*, tom. i. 755: where he uses similar language about the Eastern 'emporium of the faith,' Constantinople.

[29] 'Percurre Ecclesias *Apostolicas*, apud quas ipsæ cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsidentur . . Proxime est tibi Achaia,—habes Corinthum: si non longe es à Macedoniâ, —habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses: si potes in Asiam tendere, —habes Ephesum: si autem Italiæ adjaces,—Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.' (*De Præscrip.* § 36.)

[30] 'Quærebam quomodo se isti [scil. Donatistæ] justè separassent ab innocentiâ cæterorum Christianorum qui, per orbem terrarum successionis ordinem custodientes, in *antiquissimis* ecclesiis constituti, ignorarent,' etc. (*Epist.* xliv. 3.)

listing the weight of a great name in support of the universal dominion of the Roman See[31].

And now we come to that enormous and shameless imposture,—commonly called the 'Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.' This presents us, in the interests of the Holy See, with a collection of letters purporting to be written by thirty of the earliest Popes of Rome, during the first four centuries of the Christian era. Skilfully attached to a large number of later epistles and decrees,—which are genuine, and which breathe the true spirit of Roman domination,—they were implicitly believed in for seven centuries; and materially contributed to rivet on the neck of Christendom that fatal yoke of a spiritual despotism, which the utmost efforts of re-awakened Europe in the sixteenth century were unable wholly to shake off. They were composed by an unknown forger, amid the deepening gloom of the middle of the ninth century. And, though suspected once or twice by thinkers of unusual independence during the middle ages[32], the imposture was never publicly detected till the era of the Reformation. It was then made known to Europe: first of all, by the Protestant historians at Magdeburg (1559); soon afterwards, by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tarragona, in Spain[33]. It was then acknowledged by Cardinal Baronius[34], the great Church historian (†1607); and

[31] Gratry, ii. 44, shows how, in so widely used a book as the Roman Breviary, this passage has been truncated and misapplied and made to serve the Papal cause.

[32] They seem to have been vehemently suspected by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, against whom they were first used by the Popes, A.D. 871. He calls them a 'poculum quod confecisti ex nominibus sanctorum apostolicæ sedis pontificum,' etc. (ap. Neander, vi. 28: Bohn). They were next called in question in 1170, again in 1324, in 1418, and 1448. (Gieseler, ii. 335.)

[33] Gieseler, ii. 335.

[34] *Eccles. Hist.* A.D. 865, § 8.

by Cardinal Bellarmin[35], the subtle Jesuit controversialist (†1621). By David Blondel, at Geneva, in 1628, the question was dragged forth still farther into the light of day, and became finally decided[36]; so that, since that time, men the most devoted to the Holy See[37] have been obliged to confess the vast imposture,—and Pope Pius VI. himself, in 1789, judged it to be worthy of the flames[38]. And yet this transparent forgery did good service at Trent; where it was quoted without rebuke by an Italian bishop, in a speech on the duty of the Church[39]. It was trusted by the great theologian, Melchior Canus, in 1563[40]. Nay, it was actually employed so late as the end of the last century, by the great saint and doctor of the Latin Church, Liguori[41],—whose handbooks are in universal circulation,—as a basis for his teaching on 'the infallibility of the Pope.'

What then does this Isidorian forgery contain? It contains, in the first two hundred and fifty pages, the supposititious letters of thirty Popes during the Antenicene period. In these, it represents St. Peter himself as saying, 'not even among the Apostles was there equality: but one was set over all.' It makes St. Clement (†100) call Peter 'the prince of the Apostles,' and assign damnation as the award for neglecting his

[35] *De Pontif. Rom.* ii. cap. 14.

[36] Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isid.* p. lxxxii. Gieseler, loc. cit.

[37] Devotus, *Instit. Canonicæ*, i. 70 (Ghent edit. 1846): 'Hodiè perspicua, non suspiciosa, omnibus est falsitas Decretalium, quæ ex penu Isid. Mercatoris educta sunt.' And Dr. Hergenröther, *Anti-Janus*, p. 112 (Engl. trans.): 'The genuine Papal Decretals, that have been preserved, begin with the year 385.'

[38] 'Seponamus collectionem hujusmodi, igni etiam (si placet) concremandam.' (*Letter to four Metropolitans of Germany*, p. 236: ap. Gratry, ii. 9.)

[39] Le Plat, *Monum. Concil. Trid.* vii. 341.

[40] *De locis Theol.* vi. cap. 4: ap. Gratry, ii. 8.

[41] *Theol. Moralis*, i. 109. Cf. Dr. Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. 255: 'The forgery of the Decretals, after they had passed for true during eight centuries, was owned by all, even in the Church of Rome. But the system built upon the forgery abides still.'

regulations. It makes Anacletus (†91) say, 'If difficult questions should arise, in case of appeal, let them be referred to the Apostolic See: for so the Apostles ordained, under the injunctions of the Saviour.' It puts into the mouth of Victor (†202) the following decree: 'Although the case of an accused Bishop may be examined by his comprovincial Bishops, still it is not lawful for them to determine the matter, without consulting the Bishop of Rome.' Zephyrinus adds (†218), 'Let the conclusion of such a cause be reserved for the Apostolic See, and then be terminated, and not before. . . To it also let all, especially those under oppression, make appeal and fly for refuge, as to a mother.' Calixtus (†223), 'It is undoubted, that the Apostolic Church is the mother of all Churches . . the head of the Church is the Roman Church.' Cornelius (†252), 'Let no priest commit his cause to any alien jurisdiction, unless appeal have been first made to the Apostolic See.' Lucius I. (†253), 'This is the holy and Apostolical mother of all Churches, the Church of Christ, which, by the grace of Almighty God, is proved to have never erred from the path of Apostolical tradition, nor succumbed to heretical innovations.' Sixtus II. (†258), 'Bishops are blameworthy, who act otherwise towards their brethren, than to the Pope of their see shall seem good.' Marcellus (†310), 'He is the head of the whole Church, to whom the Lord said, "Thou art Peter,"' &c. Eusebius (†310), 'Blessed be the Lord our God, who hath enriched the Roman Church with the ministry of blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles; and to us too, on account of the universal charge which is the privilege of the same Church,' &c.[42] Such are a few specimens of this unparalleled forgery.

[42] For all the above-quoted passages, see Hinschius, *Decret. Pseudo-Isid.* vol. i.

We turn now to the pretended Council of Sinuessa,—a place not far from Rome,—held (it is alleged) in A.D. 303; and promulgating the famous maxim, that 'the first See is judged by no man.' Of this Council Dr. Hefele, the learned Roman Catholic Bishop of Rottenburg, gives the following account. 'If the document which tells us of a synod at Sinuessa could have any pretension to authenticity, this synod must have taken place about the beginning of the fourth century, in 303. It says the Emperor Diocletian had pressed Marcellinus, Bishop of Rome, to sacrifice to the gods... A synod assembled, and Marcellinus denied the fact. The inquiry was continued in a crypt near Sinuessa, on account of the persecution. There were assembled many priests, and no fewer than three hundred Bishops; a number quite impossible for that country, and in a time of persecution... The third day, the three hundred Bishops charged Marcellinus in God's name to speak the truth. He then threw himself on the ground, and, covering his head with ashes, loudly and repeatedly acknowledged his sin, adding that he had allowed himself to be bribed with gold. The Bishops, in pronouncing judgment, formally added: *Marcellinus has condemned himself, for the occupant of the highest see cannot be judged by any one* .. This account is so filled with improbabilities and evidently false dates, that in modern times Roman Catholics and Protestants have unanimously rejected the authenticity of it. Before that, some Roman Catholics were not unwilling to appeal to this document, on account of the proposition, *prima sedes non judicatur à quoquam.* The Roman Breviary itself has admitted the account of Marcellinus' weakness[43].'

[43] Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, i. 118 (Engl. trans. i. 127). The acts of this imaginary Council are to be seen in Hardouin, i. 217.

Far more important, as giving an apparent sanction of the very highest kind to the Papal claims, was the decree attributed through many a long age to the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa (325), that all episcopal appeals should be carried before the Bishop of Rome. Nicæa, it need not be said, decreed nothing of the kind. But the history of this imposition is really curious and instructive. It is a network of fraud. We must begin by going back so far as Pope Zosimus (†418), within a century of the Nicene Council itself.

A presbyter of the Latin Church of North Africa had been degraded by his Bishop for misconduct. He, however, crossed the sea to Italy, and begged the Pope's interference. This, of course, was only too readily granted. And when three African councils were held, to protest against the interference, Zosimus alleged, as his authority for interfering, a canon of the Council of Nicæa; which was, in reality, nothing but a canon of the later and merely local Council of Sardica, A.D. 347[44]. The Africans, however, were too acute to be thus deluded. They confronted the Pope with authenticated copies of the true Nicene Canons, furnished by the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople; and ended the matter by deposing the presbyter on his own confession, and by writing a severe rebuke to the Pope both for his interference and his untruthfulness[45].

[44] 'The canons quoted by the Legates, under the title of Nicæa, were in fact those of Sardica; which Council was not received by the Greek nor the African Church.' (Hussey, *Rise of the Papal Power*, p. 47.)

[45] 'Tandem de omnibus incredibilibus opprobriis ultroneus se ipse convicit. . . Præfato itaque debitæ salutationis officio, impendio deprecamur ut deinceps ad vestras aures hinc venientes non faciliùs admittatis; nec a nobis excommunicatos ultrà velitis accipere. Quià hoc etiam Nicæno concilio definitum, facilè advertet venerabilitas tua . . Prudentissimè enim justissimèque providerunt, *quæcumque negotia in suis locis ubi orta sunt finienda* . . Quià unicuique concessum est, si judicio offensus fuerit cognitorum, ad *concilia*

But the imposition, although thus bravely detected and exposed, was persisted in nevertheless. Twenty-five years later, Pope Leo I. again alleged this Sardican canon as if it were Nicene[46]. And in a Roman collection of canons coming down from about this date, Nicæa is expressly made responsible, not only for her own genuine twenty canons, but for the whole twenty-one which were made at Sardica, and for five more besides. And here, a name being altered to make all compatible with their pretended Nicene origin, it is quite impossible to acquit the authors and the employers of this collection from the charge of deliberate fraud.

But even this was not all. In the middle ages,—as Zonaras (1120), the great Greek canonist, bitterly complains[47],—the Popes still continued falsely to employ this canon of Sardica, as if it were a canon of Nicæa. Until, at length, it became necessary to prop up their misrepresentation by a forgery. And some vehement partisan, or interested practitioner in the Roman Courts of Appeal, did not scruple to compose in the name of

suæ provinciæ, vel etiam universale, provocare. Nisi fortè quisquam est qui credat, *uni* cuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam, et innumerabilibus congregatis in *concilium* sacerdotibus denegare . . Quià illud quod pridem, tanquam ex parte Nicæni concilii, transmisistis, in conciliis verioribus . . a S. Cyrillo etc. ex authentico missis, tale aliquid non potuimus reperire. Exsecutores etiam clericos vestros, quibuscunque petentibus, nolite mittere, nolite concedere: ne fumosum typhum sæculi in ecclesiam Christi videamur inducere.' (Hardouin, i. 947.)

[46] 'Quàm autem, post appellationem interpositam, hoc necessariè postuletur,—canonum Nicææ habitorum decreta testantur; quæ à totius mundi sunt sacerdotibus constituta, quæque subter annexa sunt.' (Leo I., *Epist.* 40: Migne, i. 831.) All the annotators agree that the canons here referred to are the canons, not of Nicæa, but of Sardica,—a merely partial and local, though important, Council.

[47] 'By this canon the Pontiffs of Old Rome pretend that all episcopal appeals were referred to them: and they falsely allege that it was passed in the first Œcumenical Council of Nicæa . . But neither is it a canon of Nicæa; nor did it give to him *all* such appeals, but only appeals made by Bishops who were subject to his jurisdiction.' (Zonaras, ap. Beveridge, *Synodicon*, i. 489.)

the great Athanasius himself, two apocryphal letters addressed to Popes of the Nicene period. In these he is positively made to request that,—the Arians at Alexandria having destroyed all extant copies of the canons of Nicæa,—these 'Popes of the universal Church' would condescend to restore, 'by the authority of your Holy See, which is the mother and head of all Churches,' the previous canons, 'seventy in number,' which had 'no doubt been safely and carefully preserved at Rome.' 'For,' he continues, 'in our presence, eighty sections were treated of in the above-mentioned Council,—forty in the Greek tongue and forty in the Latin. But it seemed good to the 318 fathers . . to amalgamate ten of these sections with the rest, and reduce the whole to the number of the seventy disciples[48].' 'For we know,' adds the second pretended letter, 'that at Nicæa with one accord it was confirmed by all, that without the sanction of the Roman Pontiff no councils ought to be held, nor bishops condemned: . . and likewise, that if any one suspected partiality in his bishop, metropolitan, comprovincial bishops, or judges, he should appeal to the Roman See, —to which by special privilege the power of binding and loosing,' &c.[49] Now this last clause bears a strong

[48] 'Domino sancto, . . Marco, sanctæ Romanæ et Apostolicæ sedis atque universalis ecclesiæ Papæ, Athanasius, etc.—Ad vos pervenisse non dubitamus, quanta et qualia ab hereticis, et maximè ab Arianis, quotidiè patimur . . Libros verò nostros usque ad minimum incendentes, nec iota unum relinquentes, propter veritatis fidem *Nicænam synodum*, quâ clerus et populus imbuebatur, . . incenderunt. Quapropter precamur, Pater beatissime,—quia non dubitamus apud vos plenaria esse Nicæni concilii exemplaria,—ut illa nobis mittatis . . Optamus ut à vestræ sanctæ Ecclesiæ auctoritate, quæ est mater et caput omnium Ecclesiarum, ea percipere mereamur,' etc. (*Athan. Op.* iv. 1446, Migne.)

[49] 'Nam scimus in Nicænâ magnâ synodo CCCXVIII. episcoporum, ab omnibus concorditèr esse roboratum, non debere absque Romani Pontificis sententiâ concilia celebrari, nec episcopos damnari; . . Similitèr et à supradictis Patribus est definitum, ut si quisquam episcopum, aut metropolitanum, aut comprovinciales, vel judices, suspectos habuerint,—vestram sanctam interpellent sedem: cui,' etc. (*Ibid.* p. 1473.)

resemblance to one of the Sardican canons already mentioned. And it seems probable that the forger had before him the same Roman collection of interpolated Nicene canons, which had been used so freely by previous Popes: but that their number had grown in his time, from the original twenty—not merely to forty-six, but—to seventy.

Nor was even this all. The great and venerable Council of Nicæa was not even yet to be let alone. These letters of the pseudo-Athanasius—such palpable forgeries, that the Benedictine editors, in 1698, actually hesitated about taking the trouble to print them, 'so full were they of falsehoods that they bore not even a shadow of genuineness[50]'—were actually employed by the great Spanish theologian, Melchior Canus[51], in the sixteenth century, in support of the Papal claims. But where then were these 'seventy Nicene canons,' of which the letters spoke so confidently, to be found? Mankind was becoming, in the sixteenth century, critical and sceptical. Would they believe in this alleged Nicene support of Popery, if no such canons could be produced?

Stimulated by such questions as these, Pope Pius IV., a lawyer and man of the world, sent Baptista, a Jesuit, to Alexandria to search for any extant copies of the desired canons. And, singular to relate, a MS. was—there and then for the first time—produced which was found to contain, in Arabic, precisely the eighty original Nicene canons mentioned by the forger of Athanasius' two epistles. They were brought to Rome, and committed

[50] 'Reliquas verò epistolas hæsimus aliquando dubii, an ederemus, necne . Commentis sunt et mendaciis respersæ, exque variis locis consarcinatæ, ut ne umbram quidem γνησιότητος referant . . Ut autem primo conspectu advertet eruditus lector, non sunt isthæc nisi laciniæ . . à falsario quodam consarcinatæ,' etc. (*Athan. Opera*, iv. 1442, Migne.)

[51] *De locis Theologicis*, lib. iv.

to another Jesuit, Turrianus, to translate. And at length, by a third Jesuit, Pisanus, they were given to the world in the Third Book of his 'History of the Nicene Council' (1572),—but not without one final touch of falsehood, by being reduced to seventy instead of eighty; in order that they might correspond more accurately to the forger's account of them in the pseudo-Athanasius[52].

Such then are the famous Arabic canons of Nicæa. And among them we find the following truly astonishing passages: 'There came together at the appointed time 318 Bishops, in the year of Christ our Lord 325 . . But among these the Roman Bishop Julius [*sic:* Silvester of course was really Bishop at that date, and Julius came twelve years later] was not present, on account of his great age. He sent, however, two presbyters of known probity and orthodoxy to represent him, and to confirm whatever might be decreed in the Council[53].' 'The Patriarch is over all those who are under his jurisdiction; just as he who holds the See of Rome is the head and prince of all Patriarchs,—inasmuch as he is the first, as was Peter, to whom was given power over all Christian princes and all their people; and is also Vicar of Christ our Lord over all nations and over the universal Christian Church. And whoever shall contradict this, is excommunicated by the Council[54].'

That such documents as these can have been *honestly* believed by the Roman ecclesiastics of the sixteenth century to have proceeded from St. Athanasius and the fathers of Nicæa, is perhaps more than can possibly be conceived. That they should serve the Papal cause to this very hour, by having been carelessly admitted

[52] Hefele, *Concilien-geschichte*, i. 345.

[53] Arabic Canons; preface. See Hardouin, i. 526.

[54] Arabic Canons, 39. Hard. i. 469.

among Liguori's proofs of 'infallibility,' in his *Moral Theology*—a work which is in the hands of every Roman Catholic priest[55]—is, however (although true), almost equally incredible; after French Benedictine editors had characterized the epistles as 'at the first glance' a forgery, and when a German theologian and bishop designates the pretended canons as 'from beginning to end false[56].' But the spirit of falsehood, which has so long been at work in the dark precincts of the Roman Curia, has not even yet, it appears, fulfilled its whole course; nor have all its shameful secrets even yet been brought out into the open light of day. How much less were men in the sixteenth century in a position to form any sound judgment on this question; or capable of doing aught but what the best among them actually decided to do, —viz., by a desperate act of faith in God and in His holy Word, to cast off the deadly incubus which weighed upon them, and to go forth at their Master's call, like Abraham, hardly knowing whither they went.

But the times, at least, are now changed. And men of sense and honour and learning, at the present day, may well indignantly protest against a system which commits them and their Churches, in the sight of Christendom, to a Papal tyranny based on such enormous falsehoods as these, which makes the German Catholic blush to record, how 'like the successive strata of the earth covering one another, so layer after layer of forgeries and fabrications was piled up in the

[55] Liguori, *Theol. Mor.* i. 109: 'Tous nos frères dans le sacerdoce ont la *théologie morale* de St. Liguori.' (Gratry, ii. 19.)

[56] 'Alle andern angeblich Nicänischen Canones durch und durch falsch sind.' (Hefele, *Concilien-gesch.* i. 347, Engl. trans. i. 362, where, however, the strength of the expression has been much softened down.)

Church[57];' and which wrings from a French priest and member of the Oratory, the almost desperate avowal, 'it is a question perfectly gangrened with fraud[58].' Above all, well may the English Churchman—in thankfulness, not in pride or contented isolation from his struggling and entangled brethren—acknowledge the great mercy of God, which has cleared his path from this network of lies, and has 'set his feet upon a rock, and ordered his goings.' Should he not, therefore, earnestly, courteously, and lovingly extend whatever aid he can to those noble men on the continent, who are now trying to carry their Churches through the same conflict, with all its inevitable miseries and confusions, which his own Church so triumphantly passed through three hundred years ago[59]?

Abandoning then—if it were possible—to merited oblivion these disgraceful and mischievous forgeries, let us proceed to ask how it really was that the Bishops of Rome came to possess the vast influence which they

---

[57] Janus, p. 117.

[58] 'C'est une question totalement gangrenée par la fraude.' (Gratry, ii. 72.) And yet not only is this writer a model of courtesy to his ecclesiastical superiors, but he retains an unshaken loyalty to his own Church in all respects but on this one question of submitting to the Papal claims. He is even careful to add, on a subsequent page, 'tous ces mensonges et toutes ces fraudes ne portent que sur *un point*, un seul,—et nullement sur aucun autre.' (p. 80.) [Ere this note goes to press, I am ashamed to add that Père Gratry too has fallen. He wrote, it appears, on Nov. 25, 1871, to the Archbishop of Paris, 'What I have written on this subject before the decision—*je l'efface*.' But 'permit me to remind you,' writes a man of nobler metal, Père Hyacinthe, 'that pages so celebrated as your last letters are not to be got rid of by ingenuously saying that they are *effaced*.' (*Daily News*, Dec. 30, 1871.)]

[59] 'As the Apostolic fishermen in the Gospel beckoned to their partners in the other ship, that they should come and help them, and they came; so, in the present day, if the "old-Catholics" in the ships of the Churches of Germany, Italy, and France, should think fit to beckon to us, who rejoice to be the "old-Catholics" of England, may we regard that invitation as a call from Christ Himself!' (Bishop Wordsworth, at the Nottingham Congress, 1871.)

certainly wielded from a very early time—thereby gaining the opportunity, which was afterwards so shamefully abused, of becoming 'lords over God's heritage'?

The answer is quite clear. And the genealogy of the modern Papacy is as historically certain, as any deduction from the records and monuments of past ages can possibly be. It is this: the *political* consequence of imperial Rome during the first four centuries of our era [60] gave to its Bishop the *primacy* among all Bishops: the primacy of this (supposed) Petrine Church generated, in ignorant hands, the legend of St. Peter's *princedom* among the Apostles: the legend of St. Peter, in dishonest and designing hands, generated the Papal *supremacy* of the middle ages: and the Papal supremacy of the middle ages has generated, at last, the Jesuit theory [61] of the personal *infallibility* of the Roman

[60] The great name of 'Rome' acted like a spell upon the imaginations of mankind; e.g. 'Theodoric se faisait Roman vis-à-vis les barbares, . . se servant du grand nom de Rome, pour les inspirer le respect ou la crainte.' (Thierry, *Cinquième Siècle*, p. 484.)

[61] All authorities agree in ascribing to the Jesuits the preparation and management of the Vatican council, and in characterizing the dogma of 'Papal Infallibility' as their one special and favourite scheme, for crushing all liberty of thought and action finally out of the Church, and for completing its subjugation to their own principles—and to themselves. The steps by which their fatal plot at length attained a (seeming) success, are well described by one who has had every opportunity of knowing what was going on: 'Die Interessen und die Anschauungen des Papstes, und die ihrer eigenen Gesellschaft, in ein und dasselbe System zu verschmelzen, bildet für sie eine Aufgabe welcher sie ebenso gerne als unschwer genügen.' Pius IX. 'wurde selbst seinerseits noch hingebender an die Jesuiten, denn je ein anderer Papst. Er hatte sie zu einem Kanale für seinen Einfluss gemacht, und wurde selber es für den ihrigen. Die Jesuiten hatten fort und fort in Rom Boden gewonnen, zumal seit der Rückkehr des Papstes. . . Ihre Theologen wurden die Orakel der römischen Congregationen. Immerdar war *die päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit* ihre Lieblingslehre.' (Lord Acton, *Gesch. des Vatic. Concils*, p. 10, 1871.) Who can wonder that this transmutation of the leading Christian bishop into an Oriental caliph, or a Thibetian 'lama,' should seem to them an object worthy of their utmost efforts,

Bishop, and his despotism, of divine right, over the very thoughts and consciences of the submissive Latin race.

There are, in fact, three steps in the ordinary Romanist argument in favour of entire submission to the Papal claims. *First*, and above all, we are confronted with the supposed fact that our Lord gave a distinct and special commission to St. Peter to become 'prince of the Apostles.' *Secondly*, we have the supposed fact that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, and handed on this special commission to all the successive occupants of that see. *Thirdly*, we are assured that, as a matter of history, the power exercised accordingly by the Bishops of Rome has been uniformly and visibly a blessed, saving, and Christianizing power, faultless in government, infallible in teaching.

Let us briefly examine each of these three supposed facts. We shall find, I believe, that the first is nothing else than a misinterpretation of our Lord's words; the second, a mere legend; and the third, an erroneous deduction from the plain facts of history.

(1) No one, of course, will deny that owing to his bold and early confession of Jesus as the Messiah, a peculiar honour was accorded to St. Peter. 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,'—this

when their own society is described by its founder as having 'engaged every thought and will of its own to Christ our Lord, and His Vicar;' when the *modus operandi* recommended by him is, that his disciples 'should permit themselves to be moved and directed by their superiors, just as if they were a corpse:' and when (incredible to relate) even conscience and the fear of God is, if necessary, to be ruthlessly stifled, —no constitutions, &c. involving 'an obligation to sin, *unless* the Superior command them in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of holy obedience; which shall be done in those cases or persons wherein it shall be judged conducive to the particular good of each, or to the general advantage.' (Constit. Soc. Jesu: Parts vi. and vii.)

looks like a personal reward and a personal promise, and probably had its fulfilment when Peter founded the Jewish Church on the day of Pentecost, and the Gentile Church in the conversion of Cornelius. Again, no one will deny that—owing mainly to his shameful fall—a special prominence was given to him after our Lord's resurrection. His Saviour's love singled him out, just as in the Parable the one erring sheep was singled out, and the one lost piece of money; and 'when he was converted,' then the suspended Apostolic commission was restored, with the words 'Feed My sheep: feed My lambs.' It was not therefore, it seems, any special designation, but rather his own *natural* forwardness and precipitancy, both in confessing and denying his Lord, which made him the foremost Apostle. For as to the supposed personal commission which is inscribed in colossal letters round the dome of St. Peter's Church at Rome, 'unto thee will I give the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,' the words are explained immediately afterwards by our Lord Himself: 'and whatsoever thou shalt bind (or loose) on earth, shall be bound (or loosed) in heaven:' and this same power is accorded, on the very next page of St. Matthew's Gospel, and in precisely the same words, to all the twelve Apostles.

At the very first step therefore, at the very first link (as it were), the whole chain of argument for a special and divinely ordered 'supremacy' in the Church gives way. A simple, natural, spontaneous 'primacy' of personal character is all that can fairly be attributed to St. Peter,—a primacy neither unrecognised nor unhonoured by our Lord, but consecrated by Him to highest uses; just as He consecrated other sweet and wholesome truths of human nature,—sending out pairs of friends and brothers on His missions,—revealing Himself by a

star to astronomers and by a draught of fishes to fishermen,—manifesting His divine power for the first time amid the innocent gaities of a wedding-feast,—and submitting during thirty long years to the tranquil home-life and handicraft employments of the carpenter at Nazareth.

And after our Lord's Ascension, the same fact of a natural Primacy in St. Peter, through his eagerness and courage in pressing to the front, meets us repeatedly in the Acts of the Apostles. But on the other hand, I am bold to say, neither there nor anywhere else among the records of the first century, is one single trace of any official *supremacy* to be found. If there is a 'supremacy' at all, it is certainly lodged in St. James, the Lord's brother, and not in St. Peter. It is St. James who presides and gives 'sentence' at the council in Jerusalem: it is St. James whose emissaries at Antioch frighten the impulsive Peter into eating no longer with the Gentiles: it is St. James who figures among the early legends of the *Clementine Homilies* as 'the Bishop of Bishops,' as sending Peter hither and thither, as charging Peter to report to him all his proceedings, and as constituting the final court of reference whereby the false teaching of Simon Magus and others might be detected and exposed[62]. But in real truth, it need hardly be said, this whole conception of a supremacy as existing in the Apostolic age is a pure illusion. It is a mere after-

[62] E.g. the introductory epistle of Clement to James is headed, Κλήμης Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ. (Clem. *Hom.* ed. Dressel, p. 10.) Farther on, Peter submits to an order from James to report to him annually about his proceedings: παρά σου ἐντολὴν ἔχειν εἰπὼν, τὰς καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὁμιλίας τε καὶ πράξεις γράφοντα διαπέμπειν σοι. (Ibid. p. 42.) And again, near Antioch, Peter says to the surrounding Presbyters, διὸ πρὸ πάντων μέμνησθε ἀπόστολον ἢ διδάσκαλον ἢ προφήτην φεύγειν, μὴ πρότερον ἀκριβῶς ἀντιβάλλοντα αὐτοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰακώβῳ τῷ λεχθέντι ἀδελφῷ τοῦ Κυρίου. (Ibid. p. 253.)

thought. And the notion of a 'Princedom' among the disciples of the lowly Jesus, we may be sure, would never have taken shape in people's imaginations, had there not grown up meanwhile a real ecclesiastical Princedom, whose existence it was necessary to account for, and whose origin it was desirable to place as far back as possible.

(2) The next stage in the argument—if it can properly be entitled an argument—by which the Romanist maintains his dogma of a divinely-instituted Papal supremacy, brings us to a really curious chapter in early Church history. It is the point where the scene changes from Jerusalem to Rome. And here a question occurs in passing, which of itself cuts at the root of the whole argument. If, as it is constantly and indefatigably asserted, the Bishop of Rome wields all St. Peter's prerogatives because St. Peter was his predecessor in the Roman see,—and no other argument, be it remembered, has ever yet been advanced for attaching all these wonderful prerogatives to Rome—why should not the see of Antioch prefer a prior claim? That Peter's first see was there, is universally confessed by Roman writers. And on *their* theory, accordingly, it is absolutely unaccountable that the Bishops of Antioch should not be entitled to the supremacy, rather than the Bishops of Rome. While on *our* theory,—that of a spontaneous supremacy engendered by the political importance of the world's metropolis,—the difficulty vanishes of itself.

But the fact is, that at this point of his argument difficulties crowd upon the Romanist at every step. Not only is he bound by his traditions to confess that St. Peter had occupied the see of Antioch before he was translated to that of Rome, but it is now well known that all such language about his occupancy of either 'see'

is a childish and nugatory anachronism. What do we mean by St. Peter being 'Bishop of Rome'? He was martyred, as Roman writers tell us, not later than the last year of Nero, A.D. 67. But if anything is made certain by modern investigations, it is that *the Diocesan system was not at that time in existence at all*[63]. 'Bishops,' we all know, are in the New Testament nothing else than Presbyters. And the Apostolic office —out of which the episcopate subsequently grew—was not, in any sense, a fixed or stationary office. Even Timothy and Titus seem to have been moveable and temporary delegates of St. Paul. And St. Clement, the supposed successor to St. Peter himself, writes at Rome a letter to the Corinthian Church, in which he never so much as hints at the existence of a Bishop either at Rome where he was writing, or at Corinth to which he was writing. Diocesan episcopacy, in short, was not yet born. It was reserved for St. John[64], and the great men of his school in Asia Minor, to set that system first in motion; and that with the intention of organizing the Church more firmly, and so enabling her—under a more centralized discipline—to win her subsequent victories

[63] 'At the close of the Apostolic age, the two lower orders of the threefold ministry were firmly and widely established; but traces of the third and highest order, the Episcopate, properly so called, are few and indistinct . . James, the Lord's brother alone, within the period compassed by the Apostolic writings, can claim to be regarded as a bishop . . But while the episcopal office thus existed in the mother church of Jerusalem from very early days, at least in a rudimentary form, the New Testament presents no distinct traces of such organization in the Gentile congregations . . The stage, in which Episcopacy definitely appears, still lies beyond the horizon.' (Prof. Lightfoot, *on Phillippians*, p. 193, 1869.)

[64] So Tertullian (A.D. 200) *c. Marcion*, iv. 5: 'ordo tamen episcoporum, ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit auctorem:' and Clem. Alex. (A.D. 220) *Quis dives*, § 42: ἐπειδὴ μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον, ἀπῄει παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἐθνῶν,—ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἁρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαινομένων.

over the swarming hosts of Gnostics, Ebionites, and other heretics, by whom she was then beginning to be surrounded. But how then can an argument be sustained, which grounds the present exorbitant pretensions of the Papacy on the plea that the Pope occupies 'the see of Peter'? And that this is, not only the main, but the *sole* ground on which the Papal supremacy rests, is acknowledged by the most eminent Romanists themselves: e.g. by Archbishop Kenrick, an American writer of the highest authority,—who, in a work dedicated to Pope Pius IX. in 1848, speaks thus: 'The principality of Peter is the real and only source of the dignity of the Roman Church[65].'

But even this is not all. Not only was St. Peter, we may rest assured, never in any intelligible sense 'the Bishop of Rome;' but we may almost certainly infer from the New Testament that he was not, in any personal sense, the Apostle of Rome or the founder of the Roman Church. St. Paul wrote an Epistle to that Church in A.D. 58, whose genuineness has never been called in question even by the most reckless German critics; and in that Epistle the very name of St. Peter is not so much as once mentioned. He is not saluted, among a whole page-full of salutations; his Episcopate is not mentioned; his Apostolate at Rome receives not one passing allusion; nay, so utterly does this Epistle overthrow any such notion, that it expressly calls the attention of the Roman Christians themselves to St. Paul's standing principle of action, viz. that he never

[65] Abp. Kenrick, *The Primacy of the Apostolic See*, p. 95 (fourth ed. 1855). So, too, Pius IX. himself, in an encyclical *Qui pluribus*, Nov. 1846: 'Ubi Petrus ibi ecclesia; ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur, et semper in suis successoribus vivit, et judicium exercet, ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem.' (*Recueil des Allocutions*, &c. [1865], p. 178.)

would interfere with the converts of another Apostle or 'build on another man's foundation[66].' And accordingly, not even the legends of the earliest period make St. Peter (as the later ones do) the founder of the Roman Church. But either Barnabas is fixed upon; or an unknown 'someone;' or—as is most in accordance with the known facts of the case—some obscure traders or soldiers or pilgrims, who had visited Judæa and brought back with them the first distant rumours of 'a messenger sent from God' to establish a 'kingdom of God' among men[67]. And yet once more, we possess four letters written by St. Paul at a later epoch, while he was residing for two years in his own hired house, in the very heart of Rome itself, viz. the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon; and again, in not one of them is there the slightest reference to any episcopate of St. Peter at Rome; in not one of them is there any apparent consciousness of St. Peter having been there, or holding any connexion whatever with the Roman Church. How is it possible to reconcile these facts with St. Peter's pretended long residence of twenty-five years, seven months, and eight days at Rome,—or even with his residence at Rome at all?

For not even yet has all been said that must be said on this—to a Romanist—absolutely vital question. So early as 1520, it began to be seriously doubted by the scholars of the sixteenth century, whether St. Peter had

---

[66] Rom. xv. 20.

[67] Cf. Clem. *Hom.* i. 6: *φήμη τις ἠρέμα, ἐπὶ τῆς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος βασιλείας, ἐξ ἐαρινῆς τροπῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν λαμβάνουσα, ηὔξανεν ἑκάστοτε . . . καὶ δήποτέ τις, πρὸς αὐτῷ τῷ ἔτει ἐν φθινοπωρινῇ τροπῇ, δημοσίᾳ στὰς ἐβόα λέγων· ἄνδρες Ῥωμαῖοι, ἀκούσατε! ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ πάρεστιν, κ.τ.λ.:* and Clem. *Recognitiones*, i. 6: 'Hæc et horum similia processu temporis, crebris jam non rumoribus sed manifestis quodammodo adventantium se illis partibus nuntiis firmabantur.. Donec, sub eodem anno, vir quidam adstans in urbis loco celeberrimo proclamaret ad populum, dicens: Audite me, O cives

ever really been to Rome at all[68]. And now, with the increased information of the present day, I venture to say that no one who has been accustomed to investigations of this kind, and to the critical treatment of legend, can any longer entertain much doubt that the whole story is fictitious from beginning to end. It reposes entirely on two mistakes, (1) that of certain commentators, who misunderstood Babylon, in 1 Peter v. 13, to mean Rome[69]: (2) that of Justin Martyr about A.D. 150; who misread the inscription to the Sabine god 'Semo Sancus' on a pedestal near the Tiber, as if it referred to Simon Magus[70], and so gave occasion to the legend

---

Romani! ... Erat autem vir iste, qui hæc loquebatur ad populum, ex Orientis partibus, natione Hebræus, nomine Barnabas.' [In Clem. *Hom.* i. 9, Barnabas first appears upon the scene, not at Rome, but at Alexandria.]

[68] E. g. Velenus, 'Liber, quo Petrum Romam non venisse asseritur,' 1520. Spanheim, 'De fictâ profectione Petri in urbem Romam,' 1679, etc.

[69] This notion, though no doubt of earlier date, first comes to the surface in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 15: 'Current report has it (*φασὶ*) that he wrote the Epistle at Rome itself; and that he signifies this, by mentioning the city metaphorically under the name Babylon.' Why there should be any metaphor in the case, has yet to be explained. Archbishop Kenrick (*Primacy of the Ap. See*, p. 79) states that 'Babylon on the Euphrates was then in ruins.' But he has forgotten passages like Josephus, *Antiq.* xv. 2. 2: 'Phraates the Parthian king released him [Hyrcanus, father-in-law of Herod the Great] from his chains, and allowed him to reside at Babylon, where were a great multitude of Jews. These honoured him as High Priest and King: and so did all the Jewish inhabitants as far as the Euphrates.' (Cf. xvii. 2. 1: xviii 9. 1.) Mr. Vaux, in *Smith's Dict. Geogr.*, adds: 'The story of his [Peter] having been at Babylon is confirmed by Cosmas Indicopleustes, who wrote in the time of Justinian.' († 565.) There is no reason for the often-echoed statement that Eusebius is here quoting Papias.

[70] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 26: *ὃς ἐν τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ θεὸς ἐνομίσθη καὶ ἀνδρίαντι παρ' ὑμῶν ὡς θεὸς τετίμηται· ὃς ἀνδριὰς ἀνεγήγερται ἐν τῷ Τίβερι ποταμῷ, μεταξὺ τῶν δύο γεφυρῶν, ἔχων ἐπιγραφὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ταύτην·* ΣΙΜΩΝΙ ΔΕΩ ΣΑΓΚΤΩ. Unluckily for the authority of this testimony, a pedestal was dug up in 1574, precisely in the spot indicated, on the island 'between the two bridges,' bearing an inscription beginning '*Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum.*' Now Semo Sancus was a Sabine god, presiding over covenants and treaties, who is mentioned in Ovid, *Fasti*, vi. 213, &c. The discovery is related by Card. Baronius, *Annals*, i. 363, (ed. 1624).

to spring up, that as Peter had met and defeated Simon Magus at Samaria, so he must needs have done also at Rome[71]; a legend which forthwith expanded and furnished itself with the most detailed embellishments,—as these things always do, in an atmosphere which is favourable to them. But meantime we are met with the perfectly astounding fact, that *not one single writer, either at Rome or anywhere else,—during a whole century subsequent to St. Peter's alleged long residence at Rome,—makes the smallest or most distant allusion to any such residence*[72]. Yet meanwhile, St. Paul lived at Rome

---

[71] Observe the naïveté with which even Nich. Sanders expresses this feeling in 1592: (*De Visibili Monarchiâ*, p. 220): 'Mysterio quodam non vacare, quod princeps apostolorum Simon Petrus principem hæreticorum Simonem Magum ita in Samariâ detegit, et in Judæâ convincit, et in Italia persequitur,' etc.

[72] It is customary among Romanist writers to echo one another's statement that (1) Clem. Rom. i. 5 attests St. Peter's visit to Rome. E. g. Archbishop Kenrick (*Primacy*, &c., p. 80): 'Clement .. mentions Peter and Paul as having suffered martyrdom at Rome under his eyes.' This is really amazing. Not only is there no mention of Rome in the passage, but the very name of Peter has to be inserted by conjecture. The Roman Catholic Bishop Hefele edits the passage thus: *Λάβωμεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν [ἡμῶν] τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλου[s. Ὁ Πέτρ]ος διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ [ἕνα, οὐ]δὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπ[ήνεγκεν] πόνους· καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρ[ήσας] ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλ[όμενον] τόπον τῆς δόξης. Διὰ ζῆλον [καὶ δ]* Παῦλος, *κ.τ.λ.* (2) That Ignatius *ad Rom.* § 4, attests the same thing. His words are these: *Παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, μὴ εὔνοια ἄκαιρος γένησθέ μοι! ἄφετέ με θηρίων εἶναι βορὰν ... Οὐχ, ὡς Πέτρος καὶ* Παῦλος, *διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν· ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐγὼ κατάκριτος.* (3) That Papias (ap. Euseb. ii. 15) adds whatever weight his testimony may have, in the same direction. The passage runs as follows: *Γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθὲν, φασὶ, τὸν ἀπόστολον... κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας,* (*Κλήμης ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν Ὑποτυπώσεων παρατέθειται τὴν ἱστορίαν, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπίας·*) *τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, κ.τ.λ.* It is obvious, as Storr remarks, (ap. Heinechen's Euseb. loc. cit.), that Papias says not one word about Rome; but simply attests the fact that St. Mark's Gospel was written under the influence of St. Peter. Thus, on the slightest examination, the only three testimonies previous to A.D. 150, that are adduced to support the story of St. Peter's visit to Rome, melt away into thin air. And an impartial student cannot help assenting to the judgment of Winer (*Realwörterb.* ii. 238), 'Solche Gründe kann man nur der parteiischen Kathol. Polemik überlassen.'

'two years in his own hired house,' and wrote several Epistles: St. Clement wrote at Rome a long letter to the Corinthian Church, which is extant: St. Ignatius, St. Peter's successor (as we are told) in the see of Antioch, journeying towards Rome to receive the same crown of martyrdom as, the legend informs us, Peter had attained there not many years before, sent a long letter beforehand to the Roman Church; still, no mention is found of St. Peter having died *there*, or ever having resided there: and lastly, Justin Martyr, living at Rome for some years, about A. D. 150, wrote two long Apologies for Christianity there, and even gave that very account of Simon Magus' visit and popularity in the city, on which it appears the Petrine legend was afterwards grafted; yet still neither there, nor in any other passage of his rather voluminous writings, do we find the slightest trace of any consciousness that he was living and writing on the very spot where the great Apostle St. Peter had lived and governed and had finally suffered martyrdom.

After such an extraordinary silence on the part of every single extant writer, during the whole century which succeeded the supposed event, we may well begin to ask with some amazement, where then *is* the first rumour of this legendary episcopate at Rome to be found? Well, this all-important and to a Romanist absolutely essential episcopate is first heard of, among all literature, in the pages of a heretical religious novel, the *Clementine Homilies*,—a purely fictitious work, attributed with great probability to the third quarter of the second century, and written (it has been shrewdly suspected) with a strong Ebionite purpose of elevating St. Peter the Jewish Apostle, at the expense of St. Paul the

Apostle of the Gentiles[73]. The book, with its sensational plot and very beautiful style, appears to have gained a wide circulation and to have passed through a good many revisions. And its influence may possibly have been enough, falling in, as it did, with the prevalent Judaizing tendencies at Rome, to float the Petrine legend fairly out upon the wide sea of men's fancy. Henceforth, accordingly, the legend begins to grow, in the usual manner, by perpetual imaginative accretions. It first comes to the surface in a fragment of Dionysius of Corinth, (†178[74]) — a writer who, in defiance of the New Testament, makes St. Peter and St. Paul to have

[73] Cf. Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* i. 264: 'The fiction of St. Peter being first Bishop of Rome proceeded from the Clementines; and was propagated in the Catholic Church by the Recognitions.' Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien und Recognitionem des Clem. Rom.*, p. 435: 'The original groundwork must have appeared after A.D. 150; the Homilies after A.D. 160; the Recognitions after A.D. 170.' Cotelerius, (ap. Dressel, Clem. *Hom.* p. 418): 'They are full of errors, the offspring of semi-Christian philosophy and of heresy, especially of an Ebionite character.'—The scene of this most curious theological Romance is laid in Syria. But in the *Homilies*, p. 11 (edit. Dressel), we find this passage: *οὗτος αὐτός, διὰ τὴν ἄμετρον πρὸς ἀνθρώπους στοργὴν . . μέχρις ἐνταῦθα τῇ Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος, θεοβουλήτῳ διδασκαλίᾳ σώζων ἀνθρώπους, αὐτὸς τοῦ νῦν βίου βιαίως τὸ ζῆν μετήλλαξεν.* (cf. also p. 39.) In the *Recognitions* (a Latin form of the Romance), iii. 63–68, the reasons for this journey are set forth: 'debemus enim auxilium aliquod ferre Gentibus, quæ ad salutem vocatæ sunt. Ipsi audistis quod Simon, præcedere volens iter nostrum, profectus est [i.e. towards Rome]; quem oportuerat e vestigio insequi; ut, sicubi aliquos subvertere tentaret, continuò confutaretur a nobis.' It is impossible to avoid the suspicion that St. Paul, the anti-Judaizing Apostle to the Gentiles, is here glanced at; as he certainly is in *Recogn.* i. 71, and *Hom.* xvii. 14 and 19. But, however this may be, one link only is wanting to connect the story with Justin Martyr's imaginary inscription: and that is found in a third apocryphal book, of a kindred character, but of later date, viz. a *History of the Apostles*, by a pseudo-Abdias, ordained Bishop of Babylon in Mesopotamia by St. Peter. Here Simon boasts, 'in aëre volando invehar: adorabor ut Dominus: publicè divinis donabor honoribus: ita ut simulacrum mihi statuentes, tanquam Dominum colant et adorent.' And presently, a deluded disciple complains, 'Rogabat me cum ipso ut proficiscerer, dicens se Romam petere. Ibi enim se tantum placiturum, ut Dominus putetur et divinis publicè donetur honoribus.' (Fabricius, *Codex Apocr.* i. 418, 422.)

[74] Dion. Cor. *Fragm. ap. Euseb.* ii. 25.

laboured together at Corinth, and to have sailed from thence in company to Rome. It then appears in Irenæus, (†202[75])—with the addition that St. Mark was with Peter as his interpreter. Next, in Tertullian (†243[76])—with the addition that St. Peter was crucified and St. John was plunged unharmed into a cauldron of boiling oil. Then, in Clement of Alexandria (†220[77]),—with additions about the entreaty of the Romans to St. Mark to write down what St. Peter had just preached to them. Then in Origen, Clement's pupil (†251[78]),—with the addition that Peter was crucified with his head downwards. Then in Eusebius (†340[79]),—who adds, for the first time, that he came to Rome so early as the second year of Claudius, [A. D. 42: a date historically irreconcileable with the New Testament], in order to meet and discomfit Simon Magus, the 'Simon Sanctus Deus' of Justin's mistaken inscription. Next, in the Apostolical Constitutions, (a work of about the fourth century[80]),—where we read for the first time the miraculous story of Simon's flying in the air and being brought to the ground by Peter's prayers. Next, in Arnobius (†330[81]),—where the airy flight becomes a fiery chariot, blown into pieces by the breath of Peter; and where the defeated heretic afterwards commits suicide at Brundisium. Then Jerome (†420[82]) gives us the precise duration of Peter's episcopate, viz. exactly a quarter of a

[75] Iren. *Hær.* iii. 1.

[76] Tert. *Præscr.* 36.

[77] Clem. Alex. *Fragm. ap. Euseb.* ii. 15; vi. 14.

[78] Origen, *Fragm. ap. Euseb.* iii. 1.

[79] Euseb. *Chron.* ad ann. 42. But let any one read for himself the *Acts of the Apostles*, as far as xii. 23: where an event occurs whose date is well known; viz. the death of Agrippa I., A.D. 44; read also Gal. i. 18 (probably A.D. 42), and Acts xv. (A.D. 48).

[80] *Apost. Const.* vi. 9: for the dates of its various parts, see Gieseler, i. 259: and the preface to Ultzen's edit. p. xv.

[81] Arnobius, c. gentes: ii. 12.

[82] Jerome, *de Script. Eccles.* voc. 'Petrus.'

century. And lastly, the Middle Ages have still more accurate information on the subject; and writers like Bernard Guido (1320[83]) inform us that the period was precisely twenty-five years, seven months, and eight days; that his first ordination was held in September, when he set apart six Bishops, ten Presbyters, and seven Deacons; and that he brought with him, and sent on into Gaul, two intimate friends of the blessed Virgin, together with Nathaniel, Simon the Leper, and the person who had, as a child, been 'set in the midst' by our Lord,—this last person bearing with him, as a precious relic, some of the blood of St. Stephen.

It is surely useless to go any farther. The whole story from beginning to end displays every mark of a legendary origin[84]. Its sole foundation in fact appears to be the circumstance that the primitive Church at Rome, being of Palestinian origin, maintained for some time a strongly Jewish colour; and that it sought to entrench itself against the inroads of a more Hellenic type of doctrine, by pleading the authority of 'the twelve' who had seen the Lord in Judæa, and by

[83] Guido, *Short Hist. of the Popes:* ap. Spicilegium Roman. vi. 5.

[84] For excellent specimens of legendary growth, take first the story of Helena's 'Invention of the True Cross' (1) A.D. 338, Euseb. *Vita Const.* simply tells us, she had the earth removed; and 'the monument of the resurrection' came to light. (2) A.D. 347, Cyril of Jerusalem says, the Cross was found at the same time. (3) A.D. 384, Jerome adds, it was kissed by the pilgrims. (4) A.D. 394, Chrysostom informs us, the Cross had been buried between two other crosses. (5) A.D. 400, Socrates adds, 'two nails were also found.' (6) A.D. 420, Sulp. Severus records that a corpse was brought to life by the contact with one of the three crosses. (7) A.D. 489, Sozomen completes the picture, by describing how Bishop Macarius, after prayer, carried each of the crosses to touch a dying woman, who was healed by the third and true one.—Or again, take the growth of the Labarum legend, as told in Robertson, *Church Hist.* i. Or the gradual belief in the assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which came as 'a tradition wafted westward on the aromatic breeze.' (Dr. Newman's *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, p. 398.)

laying claim to St. Peter as its true founder, rather than St. Paul.

And if it be objected that it seems impossible to imagine that, in the course of a single century after his death, the true history of a great Apostle, like St. Peter, could have become so hopelessly confused and forgotten: I answer, where then is the true history of St. Matthew the Evangelist, of St. Thomas, of St. Andrew, of St. Barnabas? Nay, where is the history of the blessed Virgin Mary? Where is the history of the childhood and youth of our Saviour Himself? How is it, that we can glean nothing new from men like Irenæus and Polycarp: that the stories preserved by so early a writer as Papias are childishly absurd and palpably false[85]: that Dionysius of Corinth does not know the earlier history of his own see: that even of an Epistle contained in the New Testament Origen is obliged to confess, 'who wrote it God alone knows[86]'? It is quite certain, in short, that the sub-apostolic age was an uncritical age; and that our Lord and Master has not willed that authentic reports of those early events should be preserved. It is useless, therefore, to kick against the pricks. It is foolish to indulge in vain regrets. But it is still more foolish to replace the unknown by the imaginary; and most foolish of all, surely, to prop up some great system or doctrine—which has a perfectly clear and natural history of its own—by an affectation of supernatural support, which it does not really possess and does not really need.

(3) For the superiority of the Roman Bishop has a perfectly intelligible history; and to one who believes in the Providential government of the Church, it re-

[85] E.g. the fragment preserved in Irenæus, v. 33. 3: cf. the opinion of Euseb. iii. 39. [86] Origen, *Fragm. ap. Euseb.* vi. 25.

quires no adventitious or miraculous authorization,—except for the scarcely legitimate purpose of dazzling and imposing upon mankind. Once disabuse our minds of the false and mischievous notion, that our Lord set up an absolute monarchy in His Church, in the person of the Apostle Peter; once get rid of the legendary tale that that monarchy was afterwards in some way transferred to the successive Bishops of Rome; and we are then free to acknowledge, with all deference and honour, the natural Primacy of the great historical and imperial See. Nor need we stop there. We may even confess the wonderful adaptation to mediæval needs of that vast ecclesiastical Dictatorship, which the most far-seeing and religious minds of that dark period welcomed and supported.

These honours of the Primacy the English Church has never (so far as I am aware) refused to the Bishops of Rome, even amid the most intolerable injuries and provocations[87]. She welcomed with gratitude the aid which, during her long struggles with heathenism, came from Rome. During the later conflicts of the Gospel against an armed and brutal feudalism, she gladly arrayed herself in line with the other Churches of the continent. She accepted the Papal Dictatorship. She stood not upon her rights. She was content to behave as though the English race had formed part of the Holy Roman Empire, to which they never had belonged. She received Italian legates, endured legions of exempt

[87] E. g. Archbishop Wake writes, in 1718, to Du Pin: 'The honour which you give to the Roman Pontiff differs little, I deem, from that which our sounder theologians readily grant him.' (*Epist.* 100: ap. Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. 334.) Such too seems to be the view of Greek Canonists of high authority: e. g. of Balsamon (A.D. 1180), ap. Beveridge, *Synodicon*, i. 486: *Εἰ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ὡς προνόμιον* [i. e. appeals, as a privilege] *εἴπῃς δοθῆναι τῷ Πάπῃ,—καινὸν οὐδὲν!*

monks, was patient when her benefices were squandered on absentee foreigners, let go matrimonial and testamentary appeals—with the floods of English gold that followed them—to Rome.

All this she bore. And no one who has ever honestly studied the history of these ages, will (I am persuaded) accuse England of cherishing any spirit of wanton disobedience, or of causelessly aiding to break up the unity of the Western Church. It was not until a series of provocations and injuries had been inflicted on her by the Popes, such as no Church is bound,—or ought, in loyalty to Christ Himself,—to endure, that the Church of England did at last take up the attitude of indignant 'protest;' an expectant and hopeful attitude which she has since resolutely maintained in the face of Europe for the last 300 years,—and for which it is possible that she may yet be rewarded, by being made helpful to restore her Master's cause of veracity, justice, and freedom, in Germany first, and then in Italy and elsewhere.

For let us call to mind what the Papacy professes to be to the Christian Church; and then compare with that pretension what, especially in later times, it has really been. The Pope professes to be the first clergyman in Europe. In him are supposed to be concentrated—hitherto by a tacit *lex regia*, but now by express utterance of the Vatican Council—all the powers and voices of every Church in Christendom. In his hands he claims to hold all the spiritual powers of the Church,—powers of exhortation, rebuke, encouragement, persuasion, teaching, all her armoury (in short) of means and aids towards the redemption of men's souls from the gross depths of superstition, dread, ignorance, worldly

greed, carnal lusts, and—that deadliest of all heresies—the divorce of religion from morality. This is his Ideal. It was for this, that the Mediæval Church placed herself passively in his hands. It was for this, we may fairly believe, that the great Head and King of the Church (whose promise to be 'with you always, even unto the end of the world,' has not, surely, been broken,) permitted for a time such a concentration of all ecclesiastical powers [88].

But now, what did Rome do with this magnificent opportunity? How was it, that she contrived to throw into so indignant an attitude of protest, first of all the whole Greek Church, and then (400 years later) the whole Teutonic Church,—alienating that whole group of nations, German, Scandinavian, and English, in whose veins the love of freedom is most ardent, whose

[88] Surely the writer of these pages is not wrong in believing, with all his heart and mind, that *superstition* is just one of those debasing diseases of the soul, which the Great Physician came to heal; that it is a gross perversion and parody of 'religious awe,' which is a feeling full of health and the beginning of all sound wisdom; and that any Church, which (on any pretence) fosters, instead of curing it, is so far doing the work of Anti-Christ instead of Christ. What words then can express one's painful feelings, in observing the unrebuked customs and habits of mind which prevail in Romanist countries! I take up two books, which happen to lie close at hand; one directed *ad clerum*, the other *ad populum*. The first, St. Liguori's *Homo Apostolicus*, iii. 118, contains such incredible follies about exorcism, as no Christian writer of the eighteenth century, much less a great saint and teacher of the clergy, should have been guilty of. The second, *les Fêtes Chrétiennes* (in the *Bibliothèque de l'Hôpital Militaire, à Toulouse*), p. 60, contains a full account of the aërial flights of the Blessed Virgin Mary's house to Loretto, and informs us, that the truth of the story is attested 'par d'innombrables miracles; par les constitutions des Souverains Pontifes; par le savant ouvrage du savant Pape, Benoit XIV.' (†1758.) The incredible *doctrinal* superstitions, engendered by the free play of men's morbid fancies, are only to be paralleled in Hinduism or the ancient Gnostic systems. (See Dr. Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. 151–174.) Surely modern Romanists must forget the dictum of the great saint and schoolman of the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas; who boldly asserts, 'Gravius est peccatum superstitionis vitium quam Dei tentatio.' (*Summa*, ii. part 2, 97. 4.)

home-life[89] is the purest and the most religious among all European peoples, and whose sound sense the most instinctively revolts against mummeries, impostures, and debasing superstitions?

Rome alienated them by wantonly outraging and putting to an open shame every one of their noblest sentiments, and every one of their most deeply-cherished Christian feelings. Had these islanders a strong love for their sea-girt *independence*, — Rome blest and sent against them, first the Norman Conqueror, then a French army in the thirteenth century[90], and, lastly, the Spanish Armada. Did they proudly remember that the Roman Empire, neither in its old shape nor yet in its new, had ever bent their race beneath its yoke,—the Papacy took them at their word and proceeded to claim them (with all other islands[91]) as a direct fief of the Holy See. Did they, first among the nations, feel the breath

[89] Read, for instance, the beautiful *Life of Perthes*, English translation, (1858). E. g. p. 176: 'What a vast wilderness the world becomes, when a man has no home!' and Polko's *Reminiscences of Mendelssohn*, English translation, p. 9 (1869): 'In his gay early youth, Mendelssohn wrote a vast deal; . . while the sun that matured this growth and increase was—his parental home. Ever blessed be such a home! No better talisman can be found, against the perils of life, for man or woman, than the memoirs of a loving home.'

[90] 'Innocent, with apparent unwillingness, had recourse to the last effort of his authority. He absolved the vassals of John from their oaths of fealty, and exhorted all Christian princes and barons to unite in dethroning the King, and in substituting another more worthy, by the authority of the Holy See. John, however, might have laughed at the impotent resentment of Innocent, had no monarch been found willing to undertake the execution of the sentence. The Pope applied to the King of France; and Philip lent a ready ear to proposals so flattering to his ambition. A numerous army was summoned to meet at the mouth of the Seine.' (Lingard, *History of England*, ii. 162: Matt. Paris, ii. 130, ed. Madden.)

[91] 'Sanè omnes insulas, quibus sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ susceperunt, ad jus beati Petri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, (quod tua voluntas etiam recognoscit,) non est dubium pertinere.' (Bull of Pope Adrian IV. to Henry II., A.D. 1155, sanctioning the English conquest of Ireland, — a fact that is surely strangely forgotten on the other side of St. George's Channel: cf. Matt. Paris, ii. 304.)

of reviving *political life*, and anticipate the coming modern epoch by noble attempts to balance and harmonize the various estates of the realm into an organized whole,—Rome has no sympathy, to this hour, for national life. She interfered at every stage[92]. Alexander III. (1164) pretended to annul the Constitutions of Clarendon. Innocent III. (1215) vetoed Magna Charta, and excommunicated all who had a hand in it[93]. Urban IV. (1261) released Henry III. from his royal duty to execute the Acts of the Parliament of Oxford. And Clement V. (1305) absolved Edward I. from his oath to observe the charters, using almost the same words as were employed only the other day in interfering with an Austrian Act of Parliament[94], 'we, by our Apostolical authority, revoke, annul, and dissolve the said concessions, and all their effects.' Did a strong feeling arise, that the *endowments attached to parishes* ought to be spent in preaching the Gospel to the poor, and not in swelling the overgrown state and wealth of foreigners who had never set foot within the country,—successive Popes laid down the maxim that all the benefices in Christendom are in their gift. And notwithstanding every remonstrance of men like Bishop Grostête[95], and every rule and canon of the Church

[92] Cf. Guizot, *Representative Government*, pp. 278, 317, 332, 357.

[93] And yet Dr. Döllinger, in 1861, had the assurance to write: 'It was the Church that the nation had to thank for the Magna Charta of 1215.' (*The Church and the Churches*, p. 105.) Probably in 1871 he would be more guarded; and would distinguish between the old Catholics of England and the Pope.

[94] Viz. in June, 1870. See *Quarterly Review*, July, 1871, p. 104: 'The Pope determined to make use of all his spiritual weapons; and on the 22nd June launched a characteristic allocution at the heads of the Austrian rebels. In this allocution the three laws in question are denounced as "destructive, abominable, and damnable. Therefore, (so runs the allocution,) on the strength of our Apostolic authority, we anathematise these laws . . and we declare the laws, by the virtue of this same authority, to be null and void."'

[95] See Grostête's celebrated letter to Pope Innocent IV., in 1253,—in

itself to the contrary, they accumulated preferments, by fifty or sixty together, upon some Italian courtier or sumptuous Prince of the Church[96].

Again, when an urgent and increasing need began to be felt in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for husbanding the *resources of the State*, when foreign wars were pressing, and the feudal militia system was beginning to give way, then,—against all protests, and sometimes even threats, from Parliament,—the covetousness of the clergy still found a shield in the Pope; till, at the Reformation, one-half of the landed property of the country was found to be in dead ecclesiastical hands[97]. When, at the same period, all good men were groaning under the manifold corruptions and imbecilities of the Church, and were demanding a timely

---

reply to a request that a canonry at Lincoln might be *reserved* for his nephew. 'Noverit discretio vestra, quòd mandatis Apostolicis affectionè filiali omninò devotè et reverentèr obedio; his quoque—quæ mandatis Apostolicis adversantur,—parentalem zelans honorem, adversor et obsto. Ad utrumque enim similiter teneor ex divino mandato . . Præterea, post peccatum Luciferi,—quod idem erit, in fine temporum, ipsius filii perditionis Antichristi, quem interficiet Dominus Jesus spiritu oris sui,—non est, nec esse potest, alterum genus peccati tam adversum et contrarium Apostolorum doctrinæ et evangelicæ, et ipsi Domino J. C. tam odibile, detestabile, et abominabile, et humano generi tam pernecabile, quàm animas—curæ pastoralis officio et ministerio vivificandas et salvandas—pastoralis officii et ministerii defraudatione mortificare et perdere . . Hæ autem (quas vocant) "provisiones" non sunt in ædificationem, sed in manifestissimam destructionem. Non igitur eas potest beata sedes Apostolica.' (*Epistolæ*, p. 432 : ed. Luard, 1861.) This manly letter was written, be it remembered, three hundred years before the iniquity of the Popes was quite full. And on his death-bed this noble Englishman, 'as if seized with a prophetic spirit, exclaimed: "Nor will the Church be free from this Egyptian bondage, except at the bloody sword's point."' (*Ibid.* preface, p. lxxxii.)

[96] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, p. 376 (sm. edit.), cf. Grostête, *Epist.* p. xlviii. 'The same year, 1240, is remarkable for the audacious attempt of the Pope to attach the Roman citizens to him, by giving them English benefices.'

[97] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, p. 336 (sm. edit.). Even so early as 1250, Matt. Paris (p. 859) tells us: 'The incomes of the *foreign* clerks in England amounted to more than 70,000 marks. The clear revenue of the King did not amount to a third of this.'

*reform*, in order to stave off a revolution,—then once more, at Pisa (1409), Constance (1414), and Basle (1431), it is the Pope that always impeded and neutralized every honest effort for good[98]; and that endeavoured in blood and flame to silence the protests and clamours

[98] It is certain that about A.D. 1400 all honest and good men in every land were perfectly shocked at the scandals and corruptions into which the Church had fallen: and were thoroughly in earnest in attempting to rectify them, by the only way which seemed open,—viz. that of General Councils. And the appeals made to the Popes, both by individuals and by the Councils themselves, to fulfil their duty by forwarding—instead of hindering—the 'reformation of the Church, in head and members,' are (in view of the sad events which followed) quite pathetic. (1) 'Too late,'—cries Nicholas of Clemangis, the spokesman of the University of Paris, before the Council of Pisa,—'too late will it repent you to have looked about after no remedies; if now, when it stands in your power, you do not see the near impending dangers.' (ap. Neander, ix. 77.) But the only result of that Council was, that the execution of Church-reform fell into the hands of Pope John XXIII.,—a man stained with every crime; who 'hoped that, by his money, his power, his policy, he should be able to *repress* all the counteractive influences of that better spirit, which for so long a time had been earnestly and ardently longing after a reformation of the Church.' (*Ibid.* p. 129.) (2) Another Council was therefore necessary. And before the Council of Constance, thus wrote Chancellor Gerson, one of the greatest men of the age: 'The Pope is not above the Gospel of God . . See, ye believers! Long ere this would they have quitted the grasp of their tyrannical rule, had you not indulged them with your obedience. The Apostles, in drawing up the Creed, did not say, "I believe in the Pope." For the common faith of Christians does not repose on the Pope, who is but a single person, and may err; but they said, "I believe in one holy Catholic Church."' (*Ibid.* p. 136.) But the only result of that Council was, that when a new Pope was elected (Martin V.) and Church-reform was entrusted to his hands, *he did nothing* but re-erect his own sovereignty, and forbade any appeal to a General Council on pain of excommunication. (*Ibid.* p. 183: Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* vii. 343.) (3) A third Council was therefore necessary. And at the Council of Basle, the assembled Fathers entreated Pope Eugenius IV. not to obstruct and neutralize their earnest efforts at reform, in the following terms: 'Hæc igitur sancta synodus prædictum beatissimum dominum Papam Eugenium, cum omni reverentiâ et instantiâ supplicat, et per viscera misericordiæ Jesu Christi exorat, requirit, et obtestatur, ac monet, quatenùs . . ab omni *impedimento* dicti Concilii penitùs desistat.' (Hardouin, viii. 1124: *Conc. Basil.* Sess. iii.) But all was in vain. Pope Eugenius and his successors won their sad and godless victory over 'Reform by the way of General Councils;' Pius II., as Pope, retracted and anathematized all he had said as Æneas Sylvius the reformer; and all good men, for half a century, absolutely despaired of the Church. (Cf. Guericke, *Kirchengesch.* p. 511.)

of the Church, by lighting, for the first time in this country, his dreadful Moloch fires for heresy. And lastly, when Christendom had awoke from its fever-dreams of fanaticism, when the Crusades were over, the mendicant orders had become 'clothed and in their right mind,' and the beautiful ideal of a purer, healthier, more natural system of things, moulded on the family rather than the convent, was dawning on mankind like sweet morning after troubled sleep,—then yet, again, the Popes understood none of these things. A celibate clergy—that fatal mistake, which (in Father Hyacinthe's words) forms the *heart-wound* among the five wounds of the Church,—making 'nations that see in it the exclusive ideal of perfection, fail to recognise the sanctity of domestic life[99]'—was still obstinately imposed on Christendom. Monastic houses were still maintained in luxury and splendour, at a time when all men of sense saw clearly that their day was over, and that the time had come for founding colleges and schools instead. And—what was worst of all—they were still persistently maintained without any effective supervision, and apart from the ordinary episcopal system of the Church, that they might serve the better for frontier fortresses of the Pope in every land[1]. The consequences

[99] Father Hyacinthe, *Orations*, p. xiii.; cf. p. 141.

[1] For the *twelfth* century, cf. Jocelin's *Chron. of Edmondsbury*, p. 2 (Tomlin's trans.): 'Now there came intelligence to Hugh the Abbot, that Richard Archbishop of Canterbury purposed coming to make a visitation of our Church by virtue of his authority as legate ['legatus natus']; and thereupon the Abbot, after consultation, sent to Rome and sought a privilege of *exemption* from the power of the aforesaid legate. On the messenger's return from Rome, there was not the means of discharging what he had promised to our lord the Pope and the Cardinals,—unless, indeed, under the special circumstances of the case, the cross which was over the high-altar, the Virgin Mary, and the St. John . . adorned with a vast quantity of gold and silver, could be made use of for this purpose.' This was in 1176: and the same exemption was procured again, in 1198

of this insensate policy are now to be seen by the traveller in every part of England. What mean those ruined and shattered abbeys, that add a romantic beauty to so many of our loveliest landscapes? Has England then, at some former time, given way to 'the blind fury of the Celt'? Has she too, at one time, belied her natural character and torn down with frantic glee these structures, in hatred of their beauty, their costliness, their sacred character? If so, why then were the cathedrals spared? Why, at every step in our land, do parish churches—often priceless gems of beauty and antiquity—stand unharmed, and shelter to this hour a religious life whose continuity has remained unbroken, in some places for eight hundred or a thousand years?

No: the lesson read by these majestic, windy ruins,

---

(p. 23). Indeed, adds Jocelin, 'the Abbot often sent his messengers to Rome,—by no means empty.' (p. 16.) For the *thirteenth* century, cf. Grostête, *Epistolæ*, p. 325, (to Cardinal Otho, A.D. 1243): 'Recogitet etiam, supplicamus, et domino Papæ suggerat vestra discretio quàm periculosum est saluti amimarum, si apud subditos vilescat auctoritas episcopalis.' See also preface, p. lxxxii. In 1253, 'the Abbey of St. Albans appealed against the Bishop's visitation, from which they claimed exemption . . . Those were no light crimes of which the dying Bishop accused the Papacy.' (Cf. also *Poems of Walter Mapes*, Camd. Soc., p. 37.) For the *fourteenth* century, cf. *Piers Plowmans Creed*, l. 915, (ed. Wright):

'He folwen nought Fraunceis, But falsliche lybbem;
And Austyne's rewle They reckeneth but a fable;
And purchaseth hem privilege Of popes at Rome.'

For the *fifteenth* century, see Gieseler, iv. 433: The mendicants boldly maintained, 'sola Papæ potestas in totâ ecclesiâ immediatò est à Christo.' 'Papa posset totum jus canonicum destruere, et novum construere.' 'Quicunque contradicit Papæ paganizat.'—For the beginning of the *sixteenth* century, cf. Erasmus, *Adagia*, ii. 8. 65, (ap. Gies. v. 34): 'Si quid moliuntur Romani Pontifices, quod paulò sit alienius ab apostolicâ illâ et priscâ sanctimoniâ, horum [sc. the Friars] potissimùm utuntur ministeriis.' All this, however, was in clear contradiction to (at least) the rule of St. Francis (see Brewer's *Monum. Francisc.* p. 564): in spite of which, in later times, they became 'infatuated slaves of the Pope.' (Hill, *Engl. Monast.* p. 412.) 'The Apostolic See,' says Clem. XIV. in a Bull of 1773, '*which owes its lustre and support to these orders*, has not only approved, but endowed them with many exemptions.'

standing roofless in their utter desolation throughout England, is one of serious and almost awful import. It is nothing less than this. There we behold the strongholds of that foreign, effete, and in its later manifestations uncanonical and anti-episcopal system, grounded on mistakes and subsisting by forgery, for which I know no better term than 'Popery.' There are the outposts of that Church-destructive despotism, which our ancestors—more Christian than their teachers—abolished, fiercely tore, and left in ruins to bleach where it fell. There too is the outside shell of an idea, potent at first for good, but afterwards for unspeakable harm,—the idea of Asceticism; of a perfection, that is, sought in a heathen manner not in Nature's plane, but beside and athwart Nature; not seeking the completion and consecration of the world and of mankind as God made them, but seeking rather to mould the world on some newly-devised plan altogether; a Manichæan system, in short, which was not tranquil health nor the way to reach health,—but a highly morbid and temporary condition, generated originally amid the horrors and confusions of an expiring ancient civilization, and now prolonged artificially, by a foreign agency, and for foreign purposes, into a dangerous and chronic malady[2]. But at length the fresh

[2] Cf. Brewer's *Monum. Franciscana*, p. xxxix.: 'The increasing communication between the West and the Eastern world had brought out, in a greater degree than ever [*c.* A.D. 1200], the Manichæan tendencies of the times. That influence had set in at all points upon Western Christendom . . . How could the Church with its doctrine of celibacy, or the monastic orders with their enforced asceticism, counteract a tendency to which their example lent encouragement? Indeed, one of the original purposes of St. Francis had been to combat this very superstitious asceticism. 'He used to say, that the servant of God ought to eat, sleep, drink, and satisfy his bodily requirements with discretion; that the body may have no occasion of complaining . . He was a great advocate of cheerfulness; saying that it was the sign of a clean

breeze blew. Tone and vigour returned to those Churches of Europe that were still susceptible of health and revival. Greece, in her rediscovered literature, once more 'overcame her fierce and barbarous conqueror.' And the linked monastic and papal systems together fell.

From that time forwards the Papacy has been essentially a question for the Latin nations[3]. The men of the Teutonic and Saxon races have found, or are finding, other methods for securing combination and unity, than a Dictatorship founded on fraud. And the Church of England, in particular, when she saw herself forced, in the sixteenth century—if she would be loyal, not to the Pope, but to the Pope's Sovereign and hers, Jesus Christ—to take some measures towards a *pro tempore* self-reform, simply purged away all absolutely intolerable abuses and superstitions; and so patiently abode, until such time as her sister Churches also (with or without the Pope) should take heart to reform also[4].

---

heart.' (*Ibid.* p. xxxiii.) So too his admirer, Bishop Grostête, 'To a friar, as a penance, enjoined to drink a cup full of the best wine: and when it had been drunk very unwillingly, he said to him, "Dearest brother, if you frequently had such a penance, you would have a much better regulated conscience."' (Luard's *Grostête*, p. lxxxix.) But all this was in vain. The friars soon followed the evil example of the monks. And what they both had come to by A.D. 1500, may be seen in the citations given by Gieseler, v. 21–42. (Cf. Wright's *Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries*,—'an event which I regard as the greatest blessing conferred by Divine Providence upon this country since the first introduction of the Christian religion,' (preface, p. v.): and Hallam, *Mid. Ages* p. 605, sm. edit.)

[3] This truth is becoming clearer every day. Let two facts be remembered: (1) That every single Pope since the Reformation has been an Italian; (2) That in the recent Vatican Council, while the Latin votes (including no less than 330 Italian prelates, in immediate dependence on the Pope) amounted to the enormous number of 589, the whole of Germany was represented by fourteen votes! (Quirinus, p. 90: *Fraser's Mag.* Dec. 1871, p. 780.)

[4] The repeated efforts that have been made by the Church of England to find a means of re-union (1) with her sister Churches that still cling to Rome, (2) with the various Protestant bodies,—form a

This attitude of our Church at the Reformation cannot indeed be too clearly or too frequently called to mind. It was not a breach or a schism that was intended. It was simply a 'protest.' Now a protest,—whether in a club, a church, or any other society,—of course signifies that the protesting party does *not* withdraw, does *not* wash its hands of the society. Else, why take the trouble to protest? When the managers of a society, for the time being, do something distinctly wrong, there are always two courses open,—either 'protest' or 'secession:' one of the two. But the choice of the one alternative necessarily excludes the other.

The former of these two courses was chosen by the Church of England in the sixteenth century: the latter by the Anabaptists and other sectaries. She is, therefore, more truly than any other Christian community in this kingdom, a Protestant Church. And her 'protest' was raised, be it remembered, in the most orderly and effective way that was then possible. It was not the act of the State. It was not the act of the King. It was the act of the Church herself in her regular convocations[5], and by the mouth of her then

chapter in her history, which is (at any rate) most honourable to herself. For the former—besides remembering the fact, that no discourtesy has ever been done by our Church to the orders conferred by Romanist Bishops—see the temperate language invariably used by our greatest divines, from Hooker downwards; and the direct efforts made by Bishop Forbes in 1658, and by Archbishop Wake in 1717, to hold out the hand of friendship to the Gallican Church. 'Du Pin's decease, the change of political relations, the ascendency of the Jesuits, quenched the hope of the restoration of union.' (Dr. Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. 236.) The efforts made by Dr. Pusey and others, in our own day, have met with a far more shameful repulse. For her efforts at Protestant re-union—besides the ordinary Church histories—see a monograph by Dr. Heinrich Heppe, *Die Kirchliche Verkehr Englands*, &c. (1859).

[5] (1) The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, in the twenty-seventh of Archbishop Warham, on 11 February, 1531, passed, 'unanimi consensu,' the following declaration: 'Ecclesiæ et cleri An-

existing, unreformed Bishops — men who were using every day the Sarum missal; were firmly holding transubstantiation, the seven sacraments, and auricular confession; and many of whom afterwards stiffly refused any further changes[6]. It was by these men, in the Convocation of 1531, that the Church of England cast off from her neck the fatal incubus of the Papal supremacy. Regretfully and hesitatingly the important step was taken. But once taken, it was firmly persevered in; in hope not to stand aloof for ever from her continental sisters; but that, a fair example once set of such local reforms as were safe and possible, a future General Council might impartially review all that

glicani, cujus singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum dominum, et (quantum per Christi legem licet) etiam supremum caput, ipsius majestatem recognoscimus.' (Wilkins, iii. 724.) The Convocation of York did the same; but here there was one dissentient voice, that of Tonstall, Bishop of Durham,—who objected simply to the *wording* of the declaration as ambiguous. (*Ibid.* 745.) Henry the Eighth, therefore, in 1533, wrote a letter to the Convocation of York, explaining the phrase 'supremum caput;' and stating clearly that 'Christ is indeed "unicus Dominus et supremus," as we confess Him in the Church daily. . . The words "et cleri Anglic.," restrain, by way of interpretation, the word "Ecclesiam," that is to say, "the clergy of England." Their laws, acts, and order of living, forasmuch as they be indeed all temporal and concerned with this life only, in those we be (as we be called) . . "caput;" and because there is no man above us here, be indeed "supremum caput." As for spiritual things, . . they have no worldly nor temporal head, but only Christ.' (*Ibid.* p. 762.) (2) In 1533, Convocation requests the King to withhold annates and firstfruits from the Pope; 'and, if he make process . . then that the obedience of the people be withdrawn from the See of Rome.' (*Ibid.* p. 761.) (3) In 1534, six great abbeys renounce the Pope's usurped supremacy. (Burnet, ii. 162.) (4) In 1538, Convocation appeals to a General Council. (*Ibid.* p. 198.)

[6] These were the men of whom even the foul-mouthed Nicholas Sanders was obliged to confess, that Henry VIII. 'episcopos (præter unum Cranmerum . .) et doctos nominavit et minimè malos. Adeò ut plerique eorum posteà, tam Edvardo quàm Eliz. regnante, ob Catholicæ fidei confessionem carceres et vincula subiverint.' (*De Schismate Anglic.*, p. 103, ed. 1585.) Yet among them all, *only one thought it his duty to protest against the Act of Convocation which, in* 1531, *severed England from the Papacy;* viz. Tonstall, Bishop of Durham. (Lingard, iv. 273.) 'The oath of supremacy was taken by Fisher of Rochester; and in all probability by Reginald Pole.' (Hardwick, *Ref.* p. 192.)

had been done, and either retrench or extend it, as might seem best for the whole family of National Churches [7].

And not only so: not only did the clergy, after three days' debate, thus break with Rome: not only did the laity, assembled in Parliament, accept and endorse what was done: but also the Universities, the Cathedral bodies, and even the great monastic societies themselves, gave their full sanction to the inevitable emancipation [8]. It is impossible to conceive, therefore, a more thoroughly unanimous movement of the whole English Church, expressing its concurrence in the most legitimate way, and by the voice of those persons in the realm whose counsel was at that time held to be of the greatest weight, and whose character stood entirely above reproach.

---

[7] This, be it ever remembered, has been the modest attitude of the English Church, from the sixteenth century down to the present day. So early as 1427, Archbishop Chichele appealed against Pope Martin V. to a future General Council (Burnet, *Records*, iv. 382): in 1533, Bishop Bonner (Henry the Eighth's envoy to Rome on the question of the Divorce) appealed to a future General Council. (Lingard, v. 9.) Luther, in 1520 (Lingard, iv. 224), and Erasmus in 1522 (Hardwick, *Ref.* p. 297), having previously done the same thing. In 1538, the Convocation of Canterbury (fifteen Bishops and forty-nine members of the Lower House affixing their signatures) affirmed: 'There never was, nor is, anything devised, invented, or instituted by our forefathers, more expedient . . than the having of General Councils.' (Burnet, *Reform.* ii. 198, 12mo. ed.) In 1562, Bishop Jewel writes: 'When, therefore, the expectation of a General Council was very uncertain . . we proceeded, and have accordingly done that which may both be lawfully done, and which hath already been often done by many pious men and Catholic bishops,—i.e. to take care of our own Church in a provincial synod. For so we see the ancient Fathers ever took that course, before they came to a General and public Council of the whole world.' (*Apology*, chap. vi. § 17.) And in 1594, Richard Hooker lays it down, as 'the best, the safest, the most sincere and reasonable way; viz. the verdict of the whole Church, orderly taken and set down, in the assembly of some General Council.' (*Eccles. Pol.* iv. 13. 8.) Meanwhile, it is allowed, even by Lancelot the Canonist (*Instit. Juris Can.* p. 15, ed. 1598), that 'interdum quæ ab his [Provincial Councils] rectè statuta sunt etiam Catholica Ecclesia recipit.' As Dr. Pusey also says (*Councils*, p. 21).

[8] Wilkins, iii. 748; Rymer, xiv. 487. (Ap. Hardwick, *Ref.* p. 194.)

And now let us notice how she employed her recovered liberty of action. I need only refer to the manner in which the difficult problem of a revision of the Liturgy was solved in 1549, in order to show the sincerely Catholic and loyal spirit which actuated her. Here, at any rate, was no break with the past; no consciousness of being anything else than the old time-honoured Church of England, engaged in the very natural task of adapting her old forms to altered circumstances[9]. First, her ritual canons were reviewed; and the existing mediæval *Prayer-books* were revised, condensed, and translated; and then were presented to the State for its sanction. She then proceeded to translate the *Holy Scriptures*, and to give them to the laity,—whom the revival of learning and the consequent spread of education had now prepared for an intelligent, as well as devotional, use of them. The next step was, to draw up in the *Thirty-nine Articles* some doctrinal canons for the guidance (in a broad and general way) of her clergy in their teaching: then to provide some ready-formed *Homilies*, for cases where trustworthy preachers could not be had: and, lastly, to undertake the difficult task of revising, and adapting to changed circumstances, her existing codes of Disciplinary *Canons*,—a work begun in the (so-called)

[9] This point cannot be too strongly insisted on, in view of the audacious statements to the contrary which are frequently hazarded by partizan writers. If such persons would take the trouble to consult original authorities,—to read the Preface to the English Prayer-book, the Acts of Parliament, 28 Hen. VIII. cap. 19, 2 Eliz. cap. 1, where the old Canon Law is spoken of as still standing, and the opinions of even the most hostile contemporary writers,—they would come to a very different conclusion. Cf. e.g., Sanders, *De Schism. Anglic.*, p. 112 (1585): 'Administrandæ autem Eucharistiæ.. parùm à Catholicorum missâ distabant.. Canon missæ pænè totus ab initio ad verbum transcriptus fuit. Signa etiam benedictæ Crucis retentæ sunt... Cranmerus sacrificio missæ interfuit quotidiè, dum regnabat Henricus.'

'Reformatio *Legum Ecclesiasticarum;*' but, owing to the untimely death of Edward the Sixth, never carried to its completion.

An English Churchman may, therefore, fairly ask, 'What more could any Church do, under the difficult and painful circumstances into which the misconduct of the Popes had plunged her, than was actually done[10]? How could any Church display more industry, more loyalty to the past, more fidelity to her Divine Master, more simple dutifulness to the laity committed to her charge, more good sense in providing against future confusions, and against the inevitable mistakes and weaknesses that accompany every effort for good in this world,—than was displayed by the Church of England

[10] 'On veut que le premier appel [au futur Concile Général] soit celui de Duplessis, émis le 13 juin, 1303; celuici . . montre un embarras excessif. Il est fait "au Concile et au S. Siège apostolique, et à celui et à ceux auxquels il peut et doit être le mieux posté de droit." Dans les quatre-vingts ans qui suivent, on trouve huit appels dont les formules sont: "Au S. Siège," "au Sacré Collège," "au Pape futur," "au Pape mieux informé," "au Concile," "au tribunal de Dieu," "à la très-Sainte Trinité," "à Jésus Christ," enfin. Ces inepties valent la peine à être rappelées; elles prouvent d'abord la nouveauté de ces appels, et ensuite l'embarras des appelants.' (De Maistre, *Du Pape*, p. 22.) Yes: but they prove three things, in addition: (1) the shameful failure of the Popes to do the high duties they had undertaken: (2) the fatal confusions which result from despotism,—in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil sphere: (3) the shocking demoralization, and inability to understand the serious earnest of uncorrupted men, which befalls even highminded persons who surrender to Jesuitism. What sound basis of personal morality, and—by inevitable consequence—what theory, worth calling for a moment 'religious faith,' can possibly be left to any one, who thoroughly accepts and assimilates the Ultramontane theory; that one Christian is bound to submit his conscience to another's, 'perinde ac si cadaver esset'—in other words, to commit moral suicide: (cf. Loyola's *Constitutions*, vi. 1, 1558): that 'Papa tantæ est auctoritatis et potestatis, ut possit quoque leges divinas modificare, . . cùm in terris Dei vices fungitur:' (Ferraris, *Biblioth. Canonica*, vii. 28, 1780): because 'what *be calls* true and right *is* true and right!' (*Barnet Cath. Magazine*, Feb. 1871, p. 11.) Nay; 'si Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes malas: nisi vellet contrà conscientiam peccare.' (Bellarmine, *De Pontif.* iv. 5.) Can moral suicide go any farther!

in the sixteenth century? It is nothing short of egregious folly, to rivet the attention predominantly on the sins and errors that may have accompanied this great movement. It is childish pedantry, to fritter away the main and leading facts of a glorious chapter in our country's history, by learned trifling over its details. It is ungrateful to the Supreme Ruler and Pilot of the Church, to vilify and disparage—by aid of the bitter and calumnious accusations of her enemies—every important actor amid a tempest which would assuredly try very severely the courage and honesty even of the most self-confident censor among our modern critics. But our English race is strangely prone to a cynical self-depreciation[11]. It far too patiently permits the enemy to repeat his calumnies and fill the air with falsehoods: till the very sons and daughters themselves of the English Church are thrown into helpless and almost ludicrous confusion, as to her real position, her true principles of action, her attitude towards the Continental Churches, and her duties towards Dissent (whether Romanist or Puritan) at home.

May God forgive both our own want of diligence in clearing up and stating these matters, and also the incredible hatred with which the separated communities, (and especially the Romanists,) have multiplied a thousand-fold the difficulties of their Mother-Church!

[11] 'Beware of that tendency . . to what he would call—if he might coin a word—"alarmism." There were great numbers of people in this country, who could not be satisfied without endeavouring to excite the imagination of the people with phantoms of constant danger.' (Mr. Gladstone, Speech at Whitby: ap. *Guardian*, Sept. 6, 1871.) Our Church's 'chief danger arises from the faintheartedness, which regards an imperilled cause as hopelessly lost.' (Dean Stanley, *Essays*, p. xi.) Our Church 'hath been honoured by our friends, feared by our enemies,—and contemned by none but ourselves at home.' (Bishop Williams, 1670: ap. Strype, *Parker*, i. xvi.)

May He prosper, and give ultimate success to, the noblest attempt that has ever yet been made to plant Christ's banner upon the citadel of a free and modern State, to infuse Christianity into the very nerves and veins of an adult and fully-organized nation, and to consecrate—not curse or secularize—science, family life, political life! For this has been (in few words) the glorious task of the old Catholic Church in modern England:—to elevate and transfigure the earthly by the spiritual, instead of separating them in Manichæan faithlessness; to combine the Hellenic and Hebrew elements in Christianity, instead of setting them at open war with each other; and to employ in God's service, and dedicate to His honour, that *Physical Science*, which has been God's honoured instrument in 'manifesting Himself' to the European races, and a sort of Old Testament of the Gentiles to lead them to Christ[12].

But these are things which neither Rome, nor those who are—by sympathy or name—her sons, have ever been able to understand. The idea is too high and (in the truest sense) too spiritual for them. The Judaizing temper, which from the beginning has found its home there, is always 'seeking after signs,' yearning for the marvellous,

[12] The 'wise men' of Babylonia were reached through their own astronomical *science* (Matt. ii. 2): the Athenians were addressed by St. Paul through the medium of their own *fine arts* (Acts xvii. 23 and 28): the men of Lystra were directed to God's revelation of Himself through *Nature* (Acts xiv. 17): and the Romans were expressly told, that 'His eternal power and Godhead' should have been clearly understood by them from the works of Creation (Rom. i. 20).—And so the Christian apologists of the second century always laboured to show the educated heathen, that in their world too, as well as in the more privileged Jewish world, God had in a hundred ways sown broadcast the dormant seeds of Christianity; that in the streets and fields of pagan Rome or Carthage were to be heard the 'testimonia animæ naturaliter Christianæ,' (Tert. *Apol.* § 17,) and in the heathen schools of moral philosophy might be found 'school-masters to lead men to Christ;' *φιλοσοφία δὲ ἡ Ἑλληνικὴ οἷον προκαθαίρει καὶ προεθίζει τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς παραδοχὴν πίστεως.* (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. § 20.)

unable to reconcile itself with the ordinary and the natural. It imposes on itself therefore the suicidal mission of 'beating back the spirit of the age[13].' It recoils from the modern world, and would fain retire into the cloister away from all the present marvellous deployment of freedom and beauty. It has never yet forgiven the revival of classic learning in the fifteenth century. It has never yet ceased to struggle, in truly pitiable blindness, for the reversal of what God then did, for the re-expulsion of Hellenic thought, for the return of the Middle Ages, for the re-enslavement of the noble and subtle Germanic mind to the gross and domineering instincts of the Latin race[14].

Accordingly, no sooner had our Church set her house in temporary order and addressed herself to the difficult task of governing her more extreme and refractory parties[15], than behold! her ancient enemy is in the field against her. Determined to regain this country, and yet already displaying a judicial blindness as to the way in which a free modern people must be dealt with, the Papacy seized the opportunity of Queen Mary's reign to try upon England those coarse methods of brutal com-

[13] Dr. Newman, *Anglican Difficulties*, p. 12. But when did St. Paul, or any great Saint or Father of the Church, hold such language as that? They did not 'beat back' their own age. They seized it, and Christianized it.

[14] 'Slowly, and at long intervals, did the Bishop of Rome emerge to a dangerous eminence . . . For some considerable part of the first three centuries, the Church of Rome and most (if not all) of the Churches of the West were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek. . . . Africa, not Rome, gave birth to Latin Christianity. Tertullian was the first Latin writer.' But 'the Church of the Capital could not but assume something of the dignity of the Capital.' (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 25.) 'Sitôt que ce grand travail de l'âme semble achevé, que les plus vastes intelligences se sont consumeés à développer l'esprit du Christianisme, et qu'il n'est plus besoin que de *regner*, on voit l'évêque de Rome s'établir au sommet de ces œuvres de vie, comme s'il en était le principe et la source' (Quinet, *Œuvres*, iii. 58.)

[15] Froude, xi. 8.

pulsion[16] which were succeeding only too fatally well in Latin Spain. But all was useless. And when (in spite both of innumerable plots and the shock of open war) Elizabeth's throne became every day more firmly secured, and when a vigorous national organization both in Church and State soon bade fair to render every attack nugatory, then at last the patience and the hopes of Rome were at an end; and on April 27, 1570, the shameful mandate went forth, bidding all who would obey Pope Pius V. to break with their own English Church, to secede and form conventicles, to abandon and dethrone their sovereign, and to subject their country, if they could, to a foreign invader[17].

---

[16] The Inquisition, with its abominable and immoral cruelties, was distinctly introduced into the Church by the *Popes*. 'Dass in dieser päpstlichen Veranstaltung (1198) die erste Anlage der nachmals sogenannten Inquisitoren zu suchen sei; welche bloss von den Päpsten abhängig,' &c. (Schröckh, xxix. 577.)

[17] The Bull is given at length in Burnet, iv. 452, small edition. It runs as follows: 'Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, &c. Regnans in excelsis, cui data est omnis in cœlo et in terrâ potestas, unam Sanctam, Catholicam et Apostolicam Ecclesiam (extrà quam nulla est salus) uni soli in terris, viz. Apostolorum Principi Petro, Petrique successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam. Hunc unum super omnes gentes et omnia regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, disperdat, plantet et edificet. . . . Illius itaque authoritate suffulti, declaramus prædictam Elizabetham hæreticam et hæreticorum fautricem; eique adhærentes in prædictis, anathematis sententiam incurisse esseque a Christi corporis unitate præcisos: Quinetiam ipsam prætenso Regni prædicti jure, necnon omni et quorumque Dominio, dignitate, privilegioque privatam: Et item, proceres, subditos, et populos dicti Regni, ac cæteros omnes qui illi quomodocunque juvaverunt, à juramento hujusmodi, ac enim prorsùs dominii, fidelitatis, et obsequi debito, perpetuo absolutos: prout nos illos præsentium authoritate absolvimus, et *privamus eamdem Elizabetham prætenso jure Regni* aliisque omnibus supradictis. Præcipimusque et interdicimus universis et singulis proceribus, subditis, populis, et aliis prædictis, ne illi ejusve monitis, mandatis, et legibus audeant obedire: qui secùs egerint, eos simili anathematis sententiâ innodamus.'—This is too much even for so gross and reckless a slanderer of the Reformation as William Cobbett to condone. 'According to the decision of the head of the Catholic Church, Elizabeth was an usurper; if she were an usurper, she ought to be set aside; if she were set aside Mary Stuart and the King of France became Queen and King of England; *England became a mere province, ruled by Scotchmen and Frenchmen;* —the bare idea of which was quite

The result was, however, hardly equal to the sanguine expectations of the framer of this bull. The English Church was not seriously damaged. Queen Elizabeth was not cast from her throne. The horrible massacres, which soon followed in France,—and for which the Pope in solemn procession gave God thanks[18],—did not shake the courage, but only aroused the indignant execration of England. And the subsequent attack of the Papal Armada ignominiously failed. The only permanent result was, that one more schismatic body was established on the English soil; and that Romanism, by the act of its own infatuated leaders, was now identical with treason to the sovereign, which it became the bounden duty of the magistrates to punish with an entirely exceptional and unwished-for severity[19].

---

sufficient to put every drop of English blood in motion.' (*History of the Reformation*, Letter x.)

[18] 'Whatever be the number [of Protestants massacred: probably, at least 20,000], not all the waters of the ocean can efface the stain upon the characters of those concerned in the massacre... Such a purely gratuitous massacre is unexampled in the annals of the world ... Alva condemned the massacre; and Micheli, the Venetian ambassador, affirms that all thinking men without distinction of creed protested against the crime.. La Mothe Fénelon declared he was ashamed to be counted a Frenchman. Lord Burghley told him, in most undiplomatic language, that "the Paris massacre was the most horrible crime which had been committed since the crucifixion of Christ." .. In Germany, the horror was hardly less than in England.' (White, *Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, p. 472.) And now behold how the infallible Pope, the self-styled Vicar of the meek and lowly Jesus, viewed the matter: 'When the news of the massacre reached Rome, the exultation among the clergy knew no bounds. The Cardinal of Lorraine rewarded the messenger with 1000 crowns; the cannon of St. Angelo thundered forth a joyous salute; the bells rang out from every steeple; bonfires turned night into day; and Gregory XIII., attended by the Cardinals and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, went in long procession to the Church of St. Louis, where the Cardinal of Lorraine chanted a *Te Deum* .. A medal was struck to commemorate the massacre; and in the Vatican may still be seen three frescoes by Vasari describing the attack. .. Gregory sent Charles the golden rose.' (*Ibid.* p. 476.)

[19] Romanist partizans persistently attempt, in the teeth of all the evidence, to represent the *political* executions of Jesuits and Seminarists in this reign as acts of *religious persecution*. Such persons cannot have honestly read the history of these times. 'On the morning of the 15th of May (1570) the Bull declaring Elizabeth deposed, and her subjects

From this time forward, Romanism has played but a sorry part in England. While some of its adherents have shown, as individuals, the very highest qualities, the leaders of the Denomination have receded farther and farther away from any sympathy with the main body of their countrymen. During the seventeenth century, rightly or wrongly, innumerable plots and Jesuitical intrigues were attributed to them. Under Charles I., a French Romanist Queen contributed materially to bring about the Great Rebellion. Her two sons, Charles II. and James II.—in different ways, the worst sovereigns

absolved from their allegiance was found nailed against the Bishop of London's door; and whatever the Catholic Powers might do, or not do, the Catholic Church had formally declared war.' (Froude, x. 59.) At home, 'its strength lay now among the meaner elements of secret conspiracy and disaffection' (*Ibid.* p. 60): —from abroad, 'if by any means the release of the Queen of Scots could be effected, fifteen or twenty thousand men could be thrown across, before Elizabeth could have notice of her danger. The Catholics would immediately rise, Mary Stuart would be proclaimed .. The country would be conquered without a struggle' (*Ibid.* p. 69): 'Liberty of conscience,' therefore said Lord Burleigh in Parliament, 'was generally good; but after the step which the Pope had chosen to take, religion had been made a question of allegiance' (*Ibid.* p. 196).—Indeed Elizabeth herself (says Dr. Döllinger, *Church and Churches*, p. 106), 'desired to retain as many elements of the old religion as possible, at least in the Liturgy and the administration of the Sacraments:' nor in fact 'was any priest executed till 1577 .. by a law made six years before' (Strype, *Parker*, ii. 134): and then only in consequence of the exasperation produced by the Jesuit Campion's proceedings (Strype, *Grindal*, p. 380): and by discovering 'in the King of Spain an intention to invade her dominions; and that a principal part of the plot was to prepare a party within the realm that might adhere to the foreigner.' (Sir F. Walsingham, ap. Burnet, book iii. sub fin.) In short, there were then—as there are now—two sorts of Romanists: (1) the quiet conscientious Romanists from childhood upwards,—and to these Elizabeth always displayed a remarkable lenity; extending it even to men like Bishop Bonner, who after subscribing to the Royal Supremacy under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., had become a fierce persecutor under Mary. (Cf. Lingard, vi. 326; Strype, *Grindal*, 34 and 150.) And (2) the turbulent political Romanists, the tools (often unawares) of foreign Jesuits and intriguers,—and for these, of course, she had no mercy. (See abundant evidence, in Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests* [written with a contrary intention], e. g. i. 84, 89, 91, 119, 141, &c., &c. Every one of these martyrs to Pope Pius V.'s political schemes died by hanging, &c. (the statutable *traitors'* death); not by burning, (the statutable *heretics'* death.)

Id 1598. No Eccles^l organization



that perhaps England has ever had—were both of them Romanists. And it was not till the country had finally concluded that no subject of the Papacy should ever more sit on the throne of these realms[20], that peace and security were at last obtained.

And meantime the foreign character of this most unjustifiable intrusion has plainly shown itself. While at this hour, in every cathedral and parish church throughout the land, the old English Service Books, according to the use of Sarum, are (in a revised and condensed form) daily and weekly to be heard,—in the Romanist chapels, on the contrary, scarcely anything English is to be heard or seen. The modern Roman Rituals have supplanted everywhere those of the ancient English Church[21]. While to this hour, on the Episcopal thrones and on the benches in Parliament are to be seen the direct successors of Chichele, Langton, Anselm, Dunstan, Augustin,—the Romanist body, after being for a long time governed by a mere commissary of the Pope[22], obtained at last, in 1851, an Episcopate of their own. But it was an Episcopate with no roots in this country; of the Roman not of the Anglican succession; bearing no commission from, and having no connexion with, Wykeham, Grostête, Langton, Chad; a mere foreign importation; whose first great public act has been to send

[20] By the (so-called) *Act of Settlement*, 13 and 14 Will. III. cap. 2: cf. Hallam, *Const. Hist.* p. 729 (small edition).

[21] The title of the modern Romano-Anglican Service Book runs as follows: 'Ordo administrandi Sacramenta, etc. in missione Anglicanâ, ex Rituali Romano jussu Pauli V. edito extractus: nonnullis adjectis ex antiquo Rituali Anglicano.' 1831. (Foye's *Romish Rites*, p. 256.)

[22] Until 1598, the Seceders had no ecclesiastical organization at all. In that year, a Rural Dean was made their governor. And this extraordinary form of Church government continued till 1623; after which time, till 1851, mere titular Bishops (of Chalcedon, Melipotamus, &c.) were sent over by the Pope, and ruled as his commissaries. (Cf. Palmer, *Orig. Liturg.* ii. 286; Lingard, vi. 312.)

to a pseudo-Œcumenical Council, as representatives of the English element in Christendom, a body of Papal nominees to vote, in England's name, for—what certainly appears to almost all Englishmen the very height of presumptuous folly—the absolute and infallible despotism of their ancient enemy over the consciences and thoughts of mankind.

To the judgment of the great Lord and real Head of the Christian Church [23], we may safely appeal, in such a quarrel as this. If in His eyes a merely *mechanical unity*,—guaranteed by the simple arrangement that His Church shall in all ages consist of those who consent to deny and affirm as one man shall direct,—if this sort of unity is of such paramount importance in His sight, as to supersede every other consideration, Divine or human, moral, intellectual, or spiritual,—then before men and angels it will, no doubt, one day appear that Christian England has utterly misread His Gospel and misunderstood His will. But if otherwise, it may perchance be made manifest, when all things are known, that the Church of our race has,—with all its faults, weaknesses, and sins,—borne a noble and consistent testimony in behalf of freedom, veracity, and manly simplicity. Her steadfast protest against a system based on forgeries, and cemented by the grossest superstitions, will appear not to have been in vain. And,—honouring to the utmost and herself upholding the principle of unity; maintaining in her cruel isolation the Catholic faith whole and undefiled, and the ancient discipline unbroken; striving amid the endless perplexities and

[23] 'Contradicit tibi, qui dicit "Meus est orbis terræ et plenitudo ejus." Non tu ille, de quo propheta "et erit omnis terra possessio Ejus." Christus hic est. Possessionem et dominium cede Huic.' (S. Bernard, *De Consid.* iii. 1: addressed to Pope Eugenius III.)

difficulties of modern life, (as no other Church in Christendom has striven,) to reconcile the ancient faith with modern science; yet all the while steadily proclaiming the temporary character of all her arrangements, her longing for reunion, her readiness to be employed in God's hand as a means thereto, and her willingness to report all she has done and to revise it (if necessary) at a *boná fide* General Council (whenever it may please God that such a Council shall be assembled);—she may, at last, receive the praise, and not the anathema, of the Lord whom she has thus honestly tried to serve; and be given no unhonoured place among the galaxy of churches that shall form His heavenly crown.

Why any need for the
Littledales plain warning
against joining the
church of Rome —
after this.

# APPENDIX D.

## *The Romanist Confession of Faith: (or the 'Creed of Pope Pius IV.,'* A.D. 1564)[1].

'Ego N. firmâ fide credo et profiteor omnia et singula, quæ continentur in Symbolo Fidei quo Sancta Romana Ecclesia utitur: viz. Credo in unum Deum . . et vitam futuri sæculi: Amen. Apostolicas et Ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissimè admitto et amplector. Item, Sacram Scripturam—juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, (cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Sacrarum Scripturarum,)—admitto; nec eam unquam, nisi juxtà unanimem consensum Patrum, accipiam et interpretabor.

'Profiteor quoque septem esse, verè et propriè, Sacramenta Novæ Legis, à Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis—licet non omnia singulis necessaria:—scil. Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam unctionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium; illaque gratiam conferre; et ex his, Baptismum, Confirmationem, et Ordinem, sine sacrilegio iterari non posse. Receptos quoque et approbatos Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritus, in supradictorum omnium Sacramentorum administratione, recipio et admitto.

'Omnia et singula quæ de peccato originali et de justificatione in S. Tridentinâ synodo definita et declarata fuerunt, amplector et recipio. Profiteor paritèr in missâ offerri Deo verum, proprium, et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis; atque in sanctissimo Eucharistiæ sacramento esse—verè, realitèr, et substantialitèr—corpus et sanguinem, unà cum animâ et divinitate, Domini nostri Jesu Christi; fierique conversionem totius substantiæ panis in Corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in Sanguinem,—quam conversionem Catholica Ecclesia "transsubstantiationem" appellat. Fateor etiam sub alterâ tantùm specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque sacramentum, sumi. Constanter teneo purgatorium esse; ani-

---

[1] This is the Confession which is imposed upon all converts to Romanism at the present day.

masque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis juvari: similitèr et sanctos, unà cum Christo regnantes, venerandos atque invocandos esse, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre; atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas. Firmitèr assero, imagines Christi sanctorum, habendas et retinendas esse; atque eis debitum honorem ac venerationem impertiendam. Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem à Christo in ecclesiâ relictam fuisse, illarumque usum Christiano populo maximè salutarem esse, affirmo.

'Sanctam catholicam et apostolicam Romanam ecclesiam omnium ecclesiarum matrem et magistram agnosco: Romanoque pontifici, beati Petri Apostolorum principis successori, ac Jesu Christi vicario, veram obedientiam spondeo ac juro. Cetera omnia à sacris canonibus et œcumenicis conciliis ac præcipuè à S. Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitantèr recipio atque profiteor. Simulque contraria omnia, atque hæreses quascunque ab Ecclesiâ damnatas et rejectas et anathematizatas, ego paritèr damno, rejicio, et anathematizo.

'Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extrà quam nemo salvus esse potest, quam in præsenti sponte profiteor et veracitèr teneo, eandem—integram et immaculatam—usque ad extremum vitæ spiritum constantissimè (Deo adjuvante) retinere et confiteri: Atque à meis subditis, vel illis quorum cura ad me in munere meo spectabit, teneri, doceri, et prædicari (quantum in me erit) curaturum,—ego idem N. spondeo, voveo, ac juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sancta Dei evangelia.'

---

# APPENDIX E.

## *The Canons passed at the Latin Council of the Vatican*, 1870.

[The Council met for the first time on Dec. 8, 1869; and continued its labours—in private and public—till Oct. 20, 1870. On that day, owing to the confusions then existing in Europe, it was pronounced by the Pope to be '*suspended*, until a more opportune and convenient time—to be named hereafter by the Holy See.' The results of its labours are contained in the two following series of Canons. The first series were publicly promulgated on April 14, 1870; and were directed against free-thinkers and other *external* enemies of the Church. The second series were promulgated on July 18, 1870; and were directed against the *internal* opponents of Papal Infallibility. They are here transcribed from an edition, in Latin and French, by M. Pelletier, Canon of Orleans; with the *imprimatur* of the Bishop of Puy, 1871.]

## SERIES I.—*Constitutio dogmatica de fide Catholica*[1].

* * * * * *

### CANON I.

*De Deo rerum omnium Creatore.*

Si quis unum verum Deum, visibilium et invisibilium Creatorem et Dominum, negaverit; *anathema sit.* Si quis, præter materiam, nihil esse affirmare non erubuerit; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit unam eandemque esse Dei et rerum omnium substantiam vel essentiam; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit res finitas, tum corporeas tum spirituales, aut saltem spirituales, e divinâ substantiâ emanasse; aut divinam essentiam sui manifestatione vel evolutione fieri omnia; aut denique Deum esse ens universale aut indefinitum, quod sese determinando constituat rerum universitatem in genera, species, et individua distinctam; *anathema sit.* Si quis non confiteatur mundum, resque omnes quæ in eo continentur, et spirituales et materiales, secundum totam suam substantiam à Deo ex nihilo esse productas; aut Deum dixerit, non voluntate ab omni necessitate liberâ, sed tam necessariò creasse quàm necessariò amat seipsum; aut mundum ad Dei gloriam conditum esse negaverit; *anathema sit.*

### CANON II.

*De revelatione.*

Si quis dixerit Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea quæ facta sunt (naturali rationis humanæ lumine) certò cognosci non posse; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit fieri non posse aut non expedire, ut per revelationem divinam homo de Deo cultuque exhibendo Ei edoceatur; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem quæ naturalem superet, divinitùs evehi non posse; sed ex seipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem, jugi profectu, pertingere posse et debere; *anathema sit.* Si quis Sacræ Scripturæ libros integros, cum omnibus suis partibus,—prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus recensuit,—pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit; aut eos divinitùs inspiratos esse negaverit; *anathema sit.*

### CANON III.

*De fide.*

Si quis dixerit rationem humanam ita independentem esse, ut fides ei à Deo imperari non possit; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit fidem divinam à naturali de Deo et rebus moralibus scientiâ non distingui, ac propterea ad fidem divinam non requiri ut revelata veritas propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis credatur; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit revelationem divinam externis signis credibilem fieri non posse; ideoque solâ internâ cujusque

[1] Here follows, in the original text, a theological discourse in four chapters; corresponding with the four 'Canons,' which are appended.

experientiâ aut inspiratione privatâ homines ad fidem moveri debere; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit miracula nulla fieri posse, proindeque omnes de iis narrationes, etiam in sacrâ Scripturâ contentas, inter fabulas vel mythos ablegandas esse; aut miracula certò cognosci nunquam posse, nec iis divinam religionis Christianæ originem ritè probari; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit assensum fidei Christianæ non esse liberum, sed argumentis humanæ rationis necessariò produci; aut ad solam fidem vivam, quæ per charitatem operatur, gratiam Dei necessariam esse; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit parem esse conditionem fidelium atque eorum qui ad fidem unicè veram nondum pervenerunt, ita ut Catholici justam causam habere possint fidem, quam sub Ecclesiæ magisterio jam susceperunt, assensu suspenso in dubium vocandi, donec demonstrationem scientificam credibilitatis et veritatis fidei suæ absolverint; *anathema sit.*

### CANON IV.

*De fide et revelatione.*

Si quis dixerit in revelatione divinâ nulla vera et propriè dicta mysteria contineri, sed universa fidei dogmata posse per rationem ritè excultam e naturalibus principiis intelligi et demonstrari; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit disciplinas humanas eâ cum libertate tractandas esse, ut earum assertiones —etsi doctrinæ revelatæ adversentur — tanquam veræ retineri, neque ab Ecclesiâ proscribi possint; *anathema sit.* Si quis dixerit fieri posse ut, dogmatibus ab Ecclesiâ propositis, aliquando secundùm progressum scientiæ sensus tribuendus sit alius ab eo, quem intellexit et intelligit Ecclesia; *anathema sit.*

## SERIES II.—*Constitutio dogmatica prima de Ecclesiâ Christi.*

* * * * * *

### CANON I.

*De Apostolici primatûs in beato Petro institutione.*

Si quis dixerit beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem, et totius Ecclesiæ militantis visibile caput; vel eundem honoris tantùm, non autem veræ propriæque jurisdictionis, primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Jesu Christo directè et immediatè accepisse; *anathema sit.*

### CANON II.

*De perpetuitate primatûs beati Petri in Romanis Pontificibus.*

Si quis dixerit non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione—seu 'jure divino'—ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat successores; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem; *anathema sit.*

## CANON III.

*De vi et ratione primatûs Romani Pontificis.*

Si quis dixerit Romanum Pontificum habere tantummodò officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solùm in rebus quæ ad fidem et morem, set etiam in iis quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent; aut eum habere tantùm potiores partes, non vero plenitudinem hujus supremæ potestatis; aut hanc ejus potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam, sive in omnes et singulas Ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles; *anathema sit.*

## CANON IV.

*De Romani Pontificis infallibili magisterio.*

Nos,—traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, —ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis Catholicæ exaltationem, et Christianorum populorum salutem (sacro approbante Concilio), docemus et 'divinitùs revelatum dogma' esse definimus; Romanum Pontificem, cùm ex cathedrâ loquitur (i.e. cùm omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro supremâ suâ apostolicâ auctoritate, doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universâ Ecclesiâ tenendam definit,) per assistentiam divinam ipsi in beato Petro promissam, eâ *infallibilitate* pollere quâ divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam—in definiendâ doctrinâ de fide vel moribus—instructam esse voluit: Ideòque *ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese,—non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ,—irreformabiles esse.* Si quis autem huic nostræ definitioni contradicere (quod Deus avertat!) præsumpserit; *anathema sit*[1].

[1] [This last Canon,—being the only one of general interest, and also that against which the 'protest' of the Old-Catholics is now being everywhere raised, is here appended in an English translation.—'We [i.e. Pope Pius IX],—adhering faithfully to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith,—with a view to the glory of our Divine Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the safety of Christian peoples (the Sacred Council approving), teach and define to be "a dogma divinely revealed,"—as follows: That the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedrâ* (that is, when—fulfilling the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians—on his supreme Apostolical authority, he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church), through the divine assistance promised him in blessed Peter, he is endowed with that *Infallibility*, with which the Divine Redeemer has willed that His Church—in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals—should be endowed: And therefore, that *such definitions of the Roman Pontiff of themselves—and not by virtue of the consent of the Church—are irreformable.* If any one shall presume (which God avert!) to contradict this our definition; let him be anathema!']

# APPENDIX F.

*A Syllabus of the principal errors of our time,—which are stigmatised in the Allocutions, &c. of our most holy Lord, Pope Pius IX.*[1]

§ 1. *Pantheism, Naturalism, and Rationalism absolute.*

'That there exists no Divine Power, Supreme Being, Wisdom and Providence, distinct from the Universe. . . That the prophecies and miracles narrated in Holy Scripture are the fictions of poets. . . .'

§ 2. *Rationalism moderate.*

. . 'That the Church ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy; leaving to philosophy the care of their correction. That the decrees of the Apostolic see and of the Roman "Congregations" fetter the free progress of science. That the method and principles, by which the old scholastic Doctors cultivated Theology, are no longer suitable to the demands of the age.' . .

§ 3. *Indifferentism and Toleration.*

'That every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason . . That the eternal salvation may (at least) be hoped for, of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ. That Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion; in which it is possible to please God equally as in the Catholic Church.'

§ 4. *Socialism, Biblical Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies, &c.*

'Pests of this description are frequently rebuked in the severest terms, in the Encycl. '*qui pluribus*,' &c.

§ 5. *Errors concerning the Church and her rights.*

'That the Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith or morals. That the Church

[1] The most important and interesting points of the celebrated 'Syllabus' of Pope Pius IX. are here given. They are taken from a reprint, with English translation, by R. Walker, Esq. (published at the *Weekly Register* office, London).

has not the power of availing herself of force, or of any direct or indirect temporal power. That ecclesiastical jurisdiction for the temporal causes—whether civil or criminal—of the clergy, ought by all means to be abolished. . . That National Churches can be established, after being withdrawn and separated from the authority of the holy Pontiff. That many Pontiffs have, by their arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western.'

§ 6. *Errors about Civil Society, &c.*

'. . That the civil government—even when exercised by an infidel sovereign—possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs; and possesses, not only the right called that of *exequatur*, but also that of the (so-called) *appellatio ab abusu* . . That the best theory of civil society requires that popular schools, open to the children of all classes, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority . . That the Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.'

§ 7. *Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics.*

'. . That knowledge of philosophical things, and morals, and civil laws, may be and must be independent of Divine and ecclesiastical authority . . That it is allowable to refuse obedience to legitimate princes; nay more, to rise in insurrection against them . .'

§ 8. *Errors regarding Christian Marriage.*

§ 9. *Errors regarding the Civil Power of the Sovereign Pontiff.*

'. . That the abolition of the temporal power of which the Apostolic See is possessed, would contribute to the liberty and prosperity of the Church . .'

§ 10. *Errors relating to Modern Liberalism.*

'That in the present day, it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship: whence it has been wisely provided by the law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the free exercise of their own worship . . That the Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.'

# LECTURE IV.

## THE BAPTISTS.

A.D. 1633.

*Leading Idea:*—'Purity' of the Church,—in its internal relations.

*Method adopted:*—Extreme attention paid to the ritual of admission.

'Si fallaciter conversis in baptismo suo peccata donantur, sine causâ ad veram conversionem posteà perducuntur! . . Debent autem timere Christi judicium: et veraci corde aliquandò converti. Quod cùm fecerint, non eos utique necesse est iterùm baptizari.' (S. Augustine, *De Baptismo*, vii. 3.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

200. Tertullian (Montanist) first objects to children's baptism.
360. Gregory Nazianzen advises 'three years old.'
1150. Waldenses, &c., refuse Infant baptism.
1522. Stork and Munzer, in Saxony, rebaptize.
1535. John of Leyden and the Anabaptists.
— Menno reforms the Baptists.
1575. Foxe writes 'No Baptists yet in England.'
1608. Amsterdam, first English Baptists.
1612. This Baptist flock returns to England.
— Edward Wightman (Anabaptist) burnt at Lichfield.
1615. First Baptist tract; against persecution.

---

1633. First Baptist congregation in England.
1645. Parliamentary orders against preachers.
1646. First Baptist 'Confession of Faith.'
1647. Colonel Hutchinson converted.
1649. Great increase: thirty Baptists in Church livings.
1653. Bunyan converted.
1660. Restoration of the National Church.
1661. Mobs attack Baptists.
1662. Baptists and others, refusing to conform, are ejected.
1674. Fierce controversy with the Quakers.
1677. Second 'Confession of Faith.'
1686. Savage persecution by James II.
1687. James the Second's 'Declaration of Indulgence' repudiated.
1689. Toleration Act passed.
— General Assembly of Baptists in London.
1732. 'The Dissenting Deputies' constituted.
1770. Bristol College for training ministers.
— 'The New Connexion of General Baptists.'
1793. Carey, &c. sailed for India.
1809. 'Baptist Magazine' begun.
1860. Norwich Chapel Case: 'open Communion.'
1861. 'The Tabernacle' opened in Southwark.

I Pair – Church Polity
II " – Sacs

Baptists 1st c. 1633 No. above

# LECTURE IV.

## THE BAPTISTS.

'The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind.'—*Matt.* xiii. 47.

WE now pass from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century. And leaving the first pair of secessions,—which went off from the Church of England, on opposite sides, on the question of 'Church Polity,'—we reach a second pair of secessions, which again departed in opposite directions,—but this time, on questions mainly connected with the Sacraments and with the Church's external 'means of grace.' The third sect, accordingly, which broke away from the National Church and went into (let us hope) a temporary separation, was one which bears this new feature in its very name. It is the denomination of the 'Baptists.'

Their first formation as a separate community in England took place in 1633; when, under the influence of foreign ideas—derived from that teeming hotbed of confusion, the newly-enfranchised States of Holland[1], the former head-quarters of the Anabaptists

[1] The States of Holland proclaimed their independence in 1572. And though they established Calvinism as the National religion, they

in the previous century—certain very strict and pious members of the Independent body in London determined to secede, and to form a fresh communion of their own[2]. In point of Church Polity, they still remained Independents. But there were three grand principles, for the sake of which they held themselves justified in making a secession: (1) for the maintenance of a more strictly Calvinistic doctrine: (2) for the exercise of a more rigorous and exclusive discipline: (3) for the practice of a more literally Scriptural ritual,—especially in the matter of Baptism.

Now all these three principles are closely connected together; and indeed they are all, fundamentally, one. And that one fundamental principle is—Puritanism. Yes; the Baptists are essentially and κατ' ἐξοχὴν 'Puritans;' and—I think it must be honestly confessed—they, and they only, are really consistent and logically unassailable Puritans. If Puritanism is true, the Baptist system is right. If Puritanism is a grand mistake, and the most singularly unchristian of all the (so to say) 'orthodox' misapprehensions of the Gospel of Jesus

---

allowed perfect freedom of conscience to Anabaptists, Lutherans, and all other communions,—including even the Romanists; though none but Calvinists were admitted to offices of State. (Mosheim, p. 600: ed. Reid.) From this time, their influence on England was very great. The Eastern Counties and London, especially, were teeming with Dutch Anabaptists. (Lingard, vi. 169.)

[2] Although there were, at an earlier period, many persons holding Baptist opinions scattered among the Independent congregations, all the best authorities are agreed that it was not till September 12, 1633, that the Baptist denomination formally separated themselves. The pastor of the first Baptist flock, numbering 'about twenty men and women, with divers others,' was a Mr. Spilsbury,—of whom nothing is known. (Cramp, *History of the Baptists*, p. 345.) A second body seceded, five years later, from the same Independent meeting in Blackfriars. A third secession followed in 1639, and established themselves in Crutched Friars. (Crosby, *English Baptists*, iii. 41.) And after 1649, their numbers rapidly increased,—especially in Cromwell's army. (Neal, iii. 380: ed. Toulmin.)

Christ, then the Baptist system falls to the ground of itself. Of this, however, there will be more to say farther on.

But now it is, surely, very remarkable that even Puritanism—when placed in a state of separation, left to itself, and free to follow its own logical self-developments—should at once display the old well-known divergence, (which is due, no doubt, to some twofold constitution of human nature); and should evolve,—precisely as the Church has done,—a Ritual and a Spiritual party. For such are the Baptists, on the one hand; and the Quakers, on the other.

If you go into a Baptist place of worship, prepared to understand what you see, you are immediately confronted with an unusual and absolutely unexampled arrangement of the Ritual machinery. In almost all other Dissenting chapels the Pulpit is everything; and you feel at once that the place you have entered is virtually a preaching-house, a hall for the delivery of lectures on religion,—not unaccompanied (however) with prayers and other subordinate observances. You see at a glance that the simple oblong building, without either aisles or chancel, is an admirable piece of common-sense, in its perfect adaptation for preaching purposes,—unwittingly copied from the similar constructions of the Preaching Friars in the middle ages. But when you enter a Baptist chapel,—disguised as the change may be,—all this has undergone a transformation. The construction is no longer adapted for preaching exclusively. *Ritual has once more made its appearance.* The return of the Christian Sacraments to their due place of honour has begun. And the post of dignity, at (what we should call) the east end of the building, has been reserved for—not indeed the Altar, but—the Font.

A strange and needless piece of perversity this seems, at first sight, and to persons accustomed to more traditional arrangements. But still, let us not be too hasty to condemn. Let us not be guilty of that most unchristian temper, which argues, 'It is not what we have been accustomed to: and therefore it must necessarily be irrational and wrong.' Let us wait and see what goes on, at this elevated and honoured Font. We see some grown-up persons approach, full of seriousness, and earnest to confess Christ before men. The minister who officiates receives them in the large deep open font, and in the name of the Holy Trinity baptizes them by immersion; and they arise (so they are taught) from that momentary grave new creatures in Jesus Christ, and members for life and for ever of His Holy Church. Surely, say what people will, and however incongruous it may all appear amid our modern life, it is a solemn and affecting ceremony. Indeed, upon reflection, we see that it is nothing more or less than the baptism of the Catholic Church; only (by a curious piece of antiquarian punctilio) a baptism performed according to a very ancient type of ritual, such as was used in Eastern climates and in those early times when the baptism of adults into Christianity was the rule, instead of being (as it is at present) the exception.

But still, we should probably ask with some surprise, 'How is it that, in the heart of a Christian country, these persons have never been brought within the Christian Church before? What have the clergy been about, that baptism into the name of Jesus Christ, and into all the blessings and privileges of His society, has never been offered to these people?' And then (it may be) the strange and confounding truth comes out, that the clergy are *not* to blame, as might have been supposed; that these

people have already been baptized, could already claim every privilege that belongs to a Christian, and instead of being now for the first time brought under the influence of Christianity, have been under it almost ever since they were born. What then *can* be the meaning of this extraordinary conduct on the part of the Baptists, —or 'Anabaptists,' re-baptizers, as they used more correctly to be called? It cannot surely be in the interests of mere antiquarianism that they have re-baptized these persons in the Eastern manner? Nor can one think it is wholly out of an exaggerated reverence for what the letter of Scripture says on the subject,—though this, it must be confessed, has something to do with their conduct. For though it is almost incredible that men of sense and maturity should, in these days, fly to Scripture for a text to sanction everything they do, it is at any rate certain that their forefathers, who first began this secession, described themselves as 'resolving, by the grace of God, not to receive or practise any piece of positive worship which had not precept or example in His Word[3].' And yet, it need hardly be said, there are numerous pieces of 'positive worship,' to be seen in every Baptist chapel throughout the kingdom, which cannot by any means be brought under this description. It is clearly, therefore, some deeper feeling than this, which has originated the practice. It is either some far profounder truth, or else some far more momentous error, which has induced good and conscientious men thus to fly in the face of Christendom; to deny the reality and validity of the Church's baptism; to unchurch thereby the vast mass of their fellow-Christians;

[3] Neal, iii. 347 ed. Toulmin. Cf. Gould, *Norwich Chapel Case*, p. clxiii.

and to relegate them among heathens who need—in spite of all that their own ministry have done for them—to be introduced quite afresh as candidates for admission at the portal of Christ's Church [4].

What, then, *is* that feeling, or that notion? (for I will not characterize it, by anticipation, as either an error or a truth.) It is simply this: not merely that the world has too much crept into the Church,—for that we shall none of us deny: not merely that the phrase 'Baptismal regeneration' has been disastrously misunderstood,—for that we shall all quite readily confess: nor merely that the sacrament of baptism has been too disgracefully thrust out of its place, and both in Christian life and worship ought to be restored to its due honour,—for to that every thoughtful and pious Churchman would most heartily assent. No: it is something more and something deeper than all that. It is (in few words) the conception *that the Church was intended by its Author to be a social, and not an educational, brotherhood* [5]; to be

[4] 'Our brethren of the baptized way would neither receive into the Church, nor pray with, men as good as themselves, because they were not baptized.' (Bunyan, ap. Gould, p. 295.)

[5] Cf. the Baptist *Confession of Faith*, 1646 (ap. Neal, iii. 563, ed. Toulmin). 'Jesus Christ, by His death, did purchase salvation for the *elect* that God gave unto Him. . . The free gift of eternal life is given to them and *to none else*. . . Faith is the gift of God, wrought in the hearts of the elect by the Spirit of God; . . All those that have this precious faith can never finally nor totally fall away. . . The Church is a company of visible saints, called and separated from the world, . . joined to their Lord and to each other by mutual agreement in the practical *enjoyment* of the ordinances commanded by Christ their head and King. . . Here are the fountains and springs of His heavenly graces flowing forth to refresh and strengthen them. . . Called thither *to lead their lives in this walled sheepfold and watered garden.*' Again, Cramp's *Baptist History*, p. 198 (new edit. 1871): 'These sentiments originated in the views entertained by Baptists respecting the *purity* of the Church. . . The Baptists would admit no members to their churches, but on personal profession of repentance and faith,—on which profession the parties were baptized. All their subsequent arrangements were founded on these pre-requisites. Every Church was a *family of believers*. . . The Church in their estimation was a holy society. All the rule and

a club for enjoying happy Christian fellowship, and not a school for bringing men gradually to Christ; to be, in short, a select and *exclusive* circle of Heaven's favourites, instead of a broad and *inclusive* 'net' for sweeping in all of every kind. It is the pleasing dream of a sort of little heaven for mutual participation of spiritual pleasures,—instead of the nobler conception of a vast and perilous field where the tares are mingled with the wheat, where Christ's husbandry, Christ's building has to be done,—and where risks are to be run, dangers courted, spiritual lepers taken in to tend and nurse, ignorance beckoned that it may be taught, weakness encouraged that it may be strengthened, childhood smiled upon and warmly welcomed, that it may be educated, guarded, matured, and rendered back at last to Christ—the good, the loving, the friend of publicans and sinners, who pleased not Himself, and gave us an example that we should become 'fellow-workers with Him.'

I am far from saying that Baptists and Calvinists do not, in spite of all their creeds and dogmas, think it their duty thus to labour with Christ. Men are, under every imperfect form of Christianity, a great deal better than their creeds. The greatest Baptist preacher in London, who lately gave his Tabernacle for a Calvinistic children's service, at which all our blood ran cold, can yet say, 'there's a bright side to everything, and a good God everywhere[6].' But still their fixed idea is the

discipline tended to the preservation of that holiness. So Baptists have thought and practised from the beginning.'—Contrast with all this the freer and grander views of the Catholic Church, as expressed by the ancient Fathers; and among our English divines, by Hooker, iii. 1. 7; Pearson, art. ix.; Field, ii. 3 init.

[6] Spurgeon, *John Ploughman's Talk*, p. 44. The 'children's service,' above mentioned, took place in November, 1868. It was conducted mainly by a Baptist minister from America: and was described at the time, by an eye-witness, in the pages of the *Daily News;* and commented upon in the *Saturday Review.*

Puritan idea; viz., that the Church consists only of holy and godly persons, or rather—as it is impossible for human eye to discriminate such persons from hypocrites—of 'professors' (as they are called), who give what seems evidence of holiness and godliness. And, therefore, carrying out this idea to its legitimate and logical conclusion, a Baptist would say—'children and immature persons (although 'of such is the kingdom of heaven') I cannot possibly allow to be fit members of a society of conscious, mature, professing believers. If I educate them, it will be as outsiders, who may one day be brought in, or who may not. If I help them, it is not as brothers and kindred, members with me of the family of Jesus Christ, but as objects for my pity, and as merely potential members of Christ's kingdom[7]. And in point of ritual too, I will be consequent and logical. Baptism I will carefully and faithfully reserve for the purpose it was originally intended to fulfil; and that was (as Richard Hooker puts it, and as the early Christians practised it) to be the doorway of admission into Christ's household,—but Christ's household, as I myself interpret it, where babes and ignorant and immature people have no right of entry.'

And now we are in a position to form our judgment upon the matter; and, both as Christians, and

[7] Cf. Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 509: 'The Baptist denomination at this period (1793)—as to a considerable extent it has been since—was largely pervaded by an ultrà-Calvinistic spirit. It was held by the ultrà-Calvinists that it was not desirable to offer the Gospel for the acceptance of the unregenerate. The *elect* only were to hear the message of salvation. Others might be urged to lead a moral life, and outwardly to observe some Christian ordinances; but were not to be asked to partake of Christian privileges.' And Gould, *Norwich Chapel Case* (1860), p. xciv: 'Mr. Collings said, "I should not hold a person a Particular Baptist, who considered that the Atonement was sufficient for the whole world; nor would I admit a person who held such doctrine to communion at the Lord's table."'

as Churchmen—who (thank God) are enfranchised from abject slavery to the mere letter of Scripture,—to decide, whether the theory which has thrown out this, at first sight, beautiful and welcome revival of an ancient piece of ritual, be not (in point of fact) a profoundly fatal form of error; directly contrary, if not to the letter, at least to the whole spirit and meaning of the Lord's institution of Baptism; one which leaves outside just those whom He in His tender pity would most desire to draw in; and commits to chance *exterior* agencies that very renewing, redeeming, transforming process, which was intended to be the tranquil, gradual, educational work carried on *within* His holy Church.

Yet, error as it most assuredly is, it has run (like a dark but interrupted thread) through the whole tissue of the Church's history, from almost the very beginning. And it has always come into view, at various periods, from the same cause, viz. as a recoil from the excessive worldliness of the Church, a protest against the low and fluctuating standard which those in authority have maintained within her sacred enclosure, and an exaggerated dread of the danger thereupon imagined to exist, that all was going wrong and that Christ was 'asleep upon a pillow.' Thus, even so early as the second century, we find Montanism coming forth as the ripened expression of a desire for greater spirituality in the Church. Even already, it seems, the society of Christ was supposed to be suffering damage from its contact with the world, and was not escaping—may we not say, was nobly refusing to escape—the risks which always attend upon conflict with evil, and upon that elaboration of mere mechanism and outward organization without which however no conflict can be effectively carried on in this world. Tertullian, therefore, the great spokesman

and leader of Montanism in the Western Church, comes forward (in the true Puritan temper) with loud and bitter accusations of the Church, for its laxity in admitting to communion those who had fallen into sin. And he is driven (just in the same manner) by the strength of his indignation, to impugn the pretensions of the outwardly organised Church to be the Church at all: 'Ecclesia quidem delicta donabit: sed Ecclesia Spiritus, per spiritalem hominem; non Ecclesia numerus episcoporum [8].'

Ere long the selfsame controversy broke out at Rome, in the Novatian schism. And here, for the first time, we hear the name of καθαροὶ ('Puritans') taken by the malcontent party. Again, some seventy years later, the same exclusive temper breaks out—and with the most disastrous results—in the Donatist schism, in North Africa. 'The Donatists held, that every Church which tolerated unworthy members in its bosom was itself *polluted* by the communion with them; . . and consequently ceased to be a true Christian Church [9].' And acting on this theory, they scouted the idea of a visible organization, with orderly succession from the Apostles, as constituting the true Church; and held the individualism of the modern Puritans: 'quicunque justis legitimisque ex causis Christianus fuerit approbatus [but by whom 'approbatus' is not said], ille meus est Catholicus [10].' And more than that, they dared to affirm that—all the admissions which had been given by the officers of the great Catholic Church into the kingdom of Jesus Christ being mere delusion and pretence—they were bound to *re-baptize* those that came over to them

[8] Tertullian, *De Pud.* § 21, sub fin.

[9] Neander, *Church History*, iii. 288 (ed. Bohn).

[10] Emeritus, a Donatist bishop, ap. Neander, iii. 295: cf. Gould, p. clxx. 'This inward change of heart is the only true condition of fellowship at the table of the Lord.'

from thence. Here then, among the Donatists of the fourth century, we have the first beginning of the Baptist system. It was, however, at once condemned by the Council at Arles (A.D. 314); and by all the great saintly men of the following period, especially St. Augustine,—who put out all his strength against so fatal a theory, contravening the most gracious purposes of our blessed Lord in establishing a visible Church upon earth[11].

But the Western Church was never to be free, it seems, from this persistent effort to spiritualize and individualize away all the force and unity of Christ's Kingdom. The very next heresy that broke out presents once more the Puritan colours. For Pelagianism too—though the distinct opponent of (what we may call) Calvinist views of grace,—still, from its strong moral and personal interest, laid far greater stress on the Purity than on the Catholicity of the Church; and taught that it should be, even in this world, 'without spot or wrinkle or any such thing[12].' Then came the Paulicians, the Cathari, the Albigenses, and other heretics of the middle ages,—all possessed with the same false idea; and all

[11] Augustine argues most earnestly against the Donatists, that Baptism, rightly and seriously performed, into the most holy name of the Trinity, should be regarded as Christ's own action, Christ's own reception of one more sinful soul into His Church,—however much the mere human minister of that admission may be supposed to be in error or even in sin. Nay, if the baptized person should himself remain, for many a long year, immersed in error and sin, still the blessing Christ has once conferred upon him only remains latent, and the now obscured light may one day gleam forth afresh. And if any Christian would shrink from rebaptizing people, every time they turned from some great sin; why should the case be altered, when they simply turn from some great (supposed) error? See his treatise *De Bapt. c. Donatistas*, passim: e. g. vii. 5, 'Baptizentur iterum hæretici, ut recipiant remissam peccatorum, si baptizantur iterum perversi et invidi:' *ibid.* 15, 'Baptismus non ipsorum, sed Christi, erat:' see also *De Unico Bapt. c. Petil.* cap. x, 'Cur non unum Baptisma, in quibus extrà ecclesiam constitutis invenerimus, confirmamus potiùs quàm negamus: ut non, ex eo quod in illis pravum est, etiam quod rectum est depravemus?'

[12] Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, i. 358.

carrying it out recklessly to its extremest consequences, by spurning the existing Church, as a mere piece of outward mechanism, and holding up to contempt her Baptism as a mere delusion, giving no admission to the true Church at all.

At last we reach, in our own country, the Lollards of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; and they too display the same principle,—maintaining e. g. that a Baptism administered by a priest in mortal sin is no real Baptism[13]; a theory which would obviously cast a doubt on the baptized condition of every one, and would throw the whole conception of an outward and visibly organized Church into utter confusion. Crushed for a time by the iniquitous compact of intolerance, whereby Henry IV. purchased the support of the clergy for his insecure title to the throne, they revived again in the following century; and struggling fiercely against the now weakened power of the hierarchy, at last fulfilled Wicliffe's own foreboding prophecy,—that to commence a Reformation might be 'columnas Ecclesiæ excitare; et (quod plus timendum est) diviso populo in partes contrarias, ex bello intestino regnum destruere[14].' And when at last the catastrophe of the 'Reformation' was over, and the Church emerged reeling from the hurricane, first Presbyterian non-conformity (like a fierce mutiny) broke out within her borders; and then, in succession, the Independents, the Romanists, and the Baptists abandoned her,—to try and sail upon their own courses: the Baptist departure taking place in the year 1633.

[13] Cf. Shirley, *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 320: 'Si episcopus vel sacerdos existat in peccato mortali, non ordinat, conficit, nec baptizat.' *Ibid.* p. 378: 'Mallem recipere panem de manu laici bene viventis et placentis Deo, quàm de manu talis sacerdotis.' *Ibid.* p. 402: 'Omnis homo sanctus et prædestinatus ad vitam æternam, etiam si sit laicus, est verus presbyter et sacerdos ordinatus a Deo ad ministrandum omnia sacramenta necessaria hominibus ad salutem.'

[14] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 270.

And surely, when all is said that can be said in its defence, it was a cruel and narrow-hearted desertion. For it was a time when England's future was darker and more doubtful than it has ever been before or since. In that very year Archbishop Laud was promoted to the see of Canterbury: Charles I. was governing without a Parliament: the chambers of his Roman Catholic Queen were a nest of cabals and treasons against the freedom of the country[15]: the Royal supremacy was being wielded with merciless severity, so as to drill the clergy into an absolute and submissive uniformity: and the clergy were only too ready to be drilled, that they might gain force as the spiritual militia of Despotism, and become once more the greatest power in the State[16]. The only thing wanting to assure complete success to the King's treasonable schemes, for converting the realm of England into a 'thorough' French despotism, was money. And an effort was therefore made—by means of loans, the (so-called) ship-money, &c.—to raise what was virtually 'taxation,' without the concurrence of Parliament. But when once the sturdy Churchman John Hampden had set the example of resisting illegal ways of taxation, then the day of resistance and of vengeance had dawned; and—with the Monarchy—the Hierarchy also (which had fallen down and worshipped the evil spirit of worldliness and ambition) was cast for sixteen years down to the ground.

And now all manner of strange experiments in ecclesiastical living began to be made. The Church of England had made her last public utterance, only six months after the opening of the Long Parliament, in the shape of those incredibly foolish and servile canons of

[15] Guizot, *English Revolution*, p. 38. [16] *Ibid.* p. 50.

1640,—which have since been by universal consent consigned to oblivion[17]. In them,—forgetful of her lofty calling to identify herself with no political parties, but to harmonize and reconcile them all, and especially to soften the harshness of privilege and repress the lawlessness of power,—she had (on the contrary) thrown her whole weight into the scale of privilege and power. And then, by proceeding to vote financial aid to the crown, she had (in her measure) deprived Parliament of the sole check it possessed upon the absolutism aimed at by the King. Can we wonder that the Church, having thus embarked her fortunes unreservedly with the cause of the Court, should have fallen with the Court: and that in the very same year in which she thus stooped to fawn upon mere rank and worldly power, she was met by the grim and uncourtly apparition of yet a second Baptist congregation establishing itself in London, under the ministry of Mr. Praise-God Barebone[18]?

What a revelation does this uncouth name present, of the wide gulf that was opening, or had already opened, between the orthodox and courtly and pedantic clergy of the Laudian type, and the prosaic, fanatical, half-educated middle-class,—who were now on the point of rising to supreme importance in the State! It was in vain that Presbyterianism essayed to bridge the gulf, and tried to save some organized form of an Established Church. It was in vain that Parliament attempted to silence the fanatical preachers who (owing to the universal loyalism of the clergy) had it all their own way in the army. The Baptists and all the other (so-called) 'sectaries' survived every attempt to put them down.

[17] They are given at length in Cardwell's *Synodalia*, i. 380.
[18] Neal, iii. 349; Gould, p. cxviii.

In 1647 Colonel Hutchinson, the governor of Nottingham, became a Baptist. In 1653 John Bunyan joined their communion and began to preach. In 1654 Vavasour Powell (once a clergyman of the Church of England) rebaptized some 20,000 converts in Wales. Nay, strange to say,—contrary to all their principles,—no less than thirty[19] Baptists crept (under the pseudo-Episcopal authority of Cromwell's 'Triers') into the sequestered livings of the Church, enjoyed her tithes and parsonages, and were not extruded till the Restoration.

So hard, so impossible, is it to keep out the love of worldly gain, by any mere system of exclusiveness. You close the door; and you find you have shut *in* the evil spirit with you into your cell. You sift among Christians, and rebaptize into some special *coterie* those whom you think to 'give evidence' of their sincerity,—but the 'evidence' will be, in a hundred cases, deceptive, and you will be certain to admit many a hypocrite within the fold.

But not merely will hypocrisy creep in, and infest, more fatally than under any free and open-air system, the close and narrow purism of these separatist societies. Another danger also attends upon them, like their shadow: and that is, the danger of *perpetual subdivision*, and of secessions (on the plea of some trifling but invincible scruples of conscience), till the whole strength and unity of the original body is frittered away. And thus its energies, which should have assailed the strongholds of sin and darkness, are wasted upon intestine quarrels and scandalous exhibitions of ignorance, bigotry[20], and superstition. Already in 1633,

[19] Cramp, p. 293: 'About thirty of the ejected belonged to the Baptist denomination.' once reason that [20] Gould, p. xcv.

continually falling away

the Baptists were split into the two main branches in which they appear at present; viz. the General Baptists,—who are opposed to Calvinism, and the Particular Baptists,—who are stern Calvinists[21]. Again, about 1654, we find Cromwell sadly troubled with some of the 'Anabaptists,' who had embraced 'Fifth Monarchy' principles; while others repudiated them[22]. About the same time, a separate branch broke off, to carry out a conscientious observance of the Jewish Sabbath-day[23]. In 1689, a split took place, on the question whether singing in Divine service were allowable or not[24]. And already, a hot dispute and division existed (which has been made the subject of a most instructive lawsuit within the last few years) as to the admission of non-immersed people to the Lord's Supper[25]. In 1719, the Baptists were divided at the so-called Salters' Hall Controversy,—on the question whether toleration was, or was not, to be extended to Unitarians[26]. In 1765, the Scotch Baptists took their rise; who have now fifteen congregations in England[27]. In 1770, the '*New* General Baptist Association' seceded, on the question of the Divinity of Christ[28]. And at the present moment, there appear to be no less than 550 Baptist congregations unattached, who own no connexion with anybody beyond the walls of their own place of meeting[29].

Can we wonder, then, that farther experience should have opened many men's eyes, and that even Cromwell should have lost all patience, and have cried out, 'Every sect saith, "Oh, give me liberty!" But give it to him,

---

[21] Skeats, p. 42.
[22] Carlyle, ii. 261. Cf. Skeats, p. 61; Neal, iii. 376.
[23] Cramp, p. 343; Mann, p. 21.
[24] Skeats, p. 92; Gould, p. lxx.
[25] Skeats, p. 92.
[26] *Ibid.* p. 306.
[27] Mann, p. 21.
[28] Skeats, p. 408.
[29] Mann, p. 295.

—and (to his power) he will not yield it to anybody else. ..We are a people that have been unhinged these twelve years; as if scattering division and confusion came upon us like things that we desired,—*these*, which are the greatest plagues that God ordinarily lays upon nations for sin[30]'? That Milton (a Baptist in creed) should be described by a Dissenting historian as 'in the later years of his life, attending no place of public worship. He was above the sects; and loathed their mutual jarrings[31]'? or that Bunyan, whom the latest historian[32] of the Baptists claims as the brightest ornament of their communion, should have said, 'I would be (and hope I *am*) a Christian... But as for those factious titles of Anabaptists, Independents, Presbyterians, or the like,—I conclude they came neither from Jerusalem nor Antioch, but rather from Hell and Babylon. For they naturally tend to divisions: you may know them by their fruits[33]'?

The fact is, that—however ostentatiously these small and select religious societies may entitle themselves 'Free Churches'—the only 'freedom' they really enjoy is that of endless and interminable subdivision. And the sole check placed upon these divisions is that very supremacy of the Law (in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil,) which, in *words*, they hotly repudiate, but which in reality they are compelled to obey—precisely as the Church of England is compelled to obey—wherever questions either of property or contract arise. For in these narrow circles, people are terribly in earnest. A storm is soon raised. And when it is raised, there are no constitutional breaks, whereby to check precipitate

[30] Carlyle, *Cromwell*, ii. 298. Cf. the Broadmead Records, p. 26; and 286.

[31] Skeats, p. 62.

[32] Cramp, p. 380.

[33] Ap. Gould, p. 295.

measures; there are no means for opposing the arbitrary will of a majority, or of some influential autocrat; there is no width or space, over which the angry waves may disperse themselves, and so the controversy may find time to cool. And the consequence is (as has been noticed by a friendly writer), that 'the most conspicuous fault of [these early] separatists was *excessive dogmatism.* It was impossible for any of them to err; impossible for any who differed from them to hold the truth. They were all infallible in their judgments, and none knew the whole counsel of God but they[34].' And of the Baptists in particular he adds: 'The spirit of controversy seemed almost to possess the body. . . Their zeal was, to a very great extent, consumed in contentions amongst themselves and with other denominations[35].'

Yet it must in fairness be said, it was not,—and still more at this day it is not,—all so expended. No doubt (as Neal tells us) in their early days they excited popular resentment and courted (what they called) persecution, by 'coarse and irritating language' and 'by disturbing congregations and dispersing challenges to dispute with any minister or ministers on the questions relative to baptism[36].' In the last century, too, their narrow ultra-Calvinism found vent in the tenet, that 'it was not desirable to offer the Gospel for the acceptance of the unregenerate,—the elect only were to hear the message of salvation[37],'—and in the present century, the stricter Baptists have refused communion at the Lord's Table to any one who held 'that the Atonement was sufficient for the sins of the whole world[38].' But still,—by the persistent and successful missions they have established, since 1792,

[34] Skeats, p. 42.
[35] *Ibid.* p. 165.
[36] Neal, iii. 367.
[37] Skeats, p. 509.
[38] Gould, *Norwich Chapel Case,* p. xciv.

in India; by the vast activity which has made them the most numerous (with one exception) of all the sects in the United States[39]; and by the noble liberality which, in the teeth of all the first principles of Calvinism, has characterized some of their greatest modern preachers (especially Robert Hall),—they have amply redeemed these faults. Their expenditure on missions now amounts to £40,000 a year; they have taken the lead in translating the Scriptures into the various languages of India; in England ten colleges are established for the training of their ministers; and eighteen periodicals, for the dissemination of their views, are circulated far and wide[40]. Yet their numbers are really, in Great Britain and Ireland, very small; only 280,000, on one (and that the most friendly) computation[41].

And now has the Church nothing to learn, from these her separated and (as we believe) erring children? Has the fault been wholly on their side? Has the protest they have raised been wholly a fanciful and groundless one? It is impossible to maintain this, in the face of all the evidence which history adduces to the contrary.

(1.) First of all, it is certain that '*worldliness*' *has far too much crept into the Church;* and that a base and despicable greed of place and power and wealth has formed a sad temptation to men of the ecclesiastical order, from the very earliest times. Even one of the twelve Apostles was covetous and unfaithful about money. Even before the second century had run out, a Roman bishop is beginning to 'lord it over God's heritage.' And the earliest Œcumenical Council is partly occupied with settling questions of precedence and 'who should be the greatest.' The admission,

[39] Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 235.

[40] Cramp, p. 475.

[41] *Ibid.* p. 473.

therefore, of such unhallowed and unseemly passions within the Church, does not date from Constantine and his establishment of the Church—as some Dissenters try to persuade themselves. They must be dated much farther back. They are rather evils inherent in human nature. And if in a ministry numbering only twelve persons, and chosen by the Lord Himself, these corruptions were not absent, how can we suppose that in a great body, like that of the Church of England, numbering 18,000 ministers,—all chosen by fallible men and by imperfect methods of selection,—there would not always be abundant room for warnings and protests against this especially ecclesiastical sin? But then, where is the sense, or loyalty, or charity, in *separating* from the Church, in order to make this protest? How much more effectually it would be made, how much more serviceably to the Church herself, if the voice of warning were raised from within! How can a peevish and sullen withdrawal be held compatible with our duty to Christ and to the brethren,—except only on some false Puritan principle, that our first duty is to ourselves; and the first object of the Church of Jesus Christ to keep out the imperfect, instead of drawing them in?

Oh hateful, thrice-accursed system of the modern Pharisaism, whereby men 'separate themselves' and stand apart from their brother, on heaven knows what 'evidence,'—insufficient, it confessedly is,—that they are better and more godly persons than he! Rightly is it called, not by the name of Christ, (whose just sentence of rebuke was never wanting for this subtlest form of human self-deception,) but by the name of a narrow dogmatist, a French lawyer of the sixteenth century! And yet, once thoroughly entangled in the coils of this portentous sophistry, no man (it seems) can

ever shake himself free, except by a miracle of God's redeeming grace. No man can emerge into the fresh and wholesome air of Catholic Christianity, except by the determined sacrifice of his mere logical and superficial consistency, and by 'becoming a fool that so he may be wise.' We dare not hope, therefore, that men who are thus entangled in Calvinism, will ever be induced, in any great numbers, to rejoin the Church,—whatever improvements in discipline she may be able to introduce.

But still, such improvements (even at the bidding of enemies) she is bound to attempt. For as an 'educational' institution, her object is not (of course) the mere *admission* of so many imperfect and immature people, but the admission of them for the purposes of training and *edification*. And therefore the true function of the ministry (the 'Ecclesia docens'), can never be properly fulfilled, unless while the admission of the *scholars* (so to speak) be as free and open as possible, the ranks of the *teachers* be carefully guarded against the intrusion of evil men, who so far from instructing and building up their weaker brethren, are themselves a hindrance, a scandal, and a mischief to them.

(2.) Another lesson which the Mother-Church is taught by the Baptists, and which she is bound to listen to, is *the mischievous folly of persecution*, in order to insure the profession of one uniform National Religion. It can never indeed be repeated too often, that this persecution, of which the pages of all Dissenting histories are so full, has not, since the Reformation, been the work of the Church of England, as such. It has always been the work of the State, and has scarcely ever taken the form of persecution for opinion, or for *heresy*,—but always for overt acts of disobedience to the magistrate, in matters which

almost every single person in those days,—Dissenter and Churchman alike—held to be legitimately within his province to arrange. Yet still, it cannot be denied, that the great Churchmen of former days lent themselves far too readily to the merely political purposes of the State; and that by their action they contributed to encourage the preposterous notion that the Church of England—an institution older than Parliament itself—was an 'Act of Parliament Church.' The real truth is, that—while the system of 'National Churches' was the old *ecclesiastical* system, which the Bishops were anxious to restore,—it was also, in the opinion of the great statesmen of the sixteenth century, the only safeguard against the *political* dangers of Popery. But it was the unhappy mistake of those times to act as though a National 'Establishment' of Religion, and political 'toleration' for conscientious Dissenters from it, could not possibly co-exist. The mistake was pardonable, because long centuries of really religious persecution in the middle ages had darkened all men's minds upon the subject. But the clergy of our Church should have been the first, instead of the last, to break this spell of darkness. Whereas the truth is that the Baptists seem to have been the first to break it. And unhappily, in breaking it, they cast off with it something with which it had no necessary connexion,—the beautiful theory of a united, homogeneous, National Church.

Let us then candidly give honour where honour is due; and (more than that) let us gratefully learn the old Catholic lesson, which our Baptist brethren have had to teach us afresh: viz. that 'the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual:' that any ecclesiastical success gained otherwise than by persuasion, warning, plain setting forth of Jesus Christ and Him

crucified, are no successes at all: that they are not according to the mind of Christ, nor in harmony with the intention of His Church: but are like a house without foundations, built upon the sand, and liable at any moment to be swept away and leave no trace behind.

(3.) Lastly, there is yet a third and by no means unimportant lesson to be learnt by the Church from the Baptists, *on the subject of Baptism itself, and of Church discipline*, with which that rite is closely connected. It is, I fear, impossible to deny that, for centuries past, a great deal of very extravagant and misleading language has been current in the Church on the subject of 'Baptismal Regeneration.' And thereby, not only has this grand and glorious truth been sadly obscured and confused, but vast numbers of pious and half-educated people have been alienated from the Church and carried away into various forms of error and Dissent. No one can have mixed much with the labouring or the trading classes, without finding out that, in their conceptions, the Church teaches by 'Baptismal Regeneration' certain crude and preposterous heresies,—which of course she never has taught, but would be the first to repudiate[42].

[42] E. g. Mr. Spurgeon (probably the most popular living exponent of Baptist views) preaches as follows: 'The man who has been baptized or sprinkled says, "I *am* saved, I *am* a member of Christ. . . Call *me* to repentance? Call *me* to a new life? . . No matter what my life and conversation is, I am a child of God; I am an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. It is true, I drink and swear, and all that, but you know I am an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven". . . Now what can be the influence of such preaching as this upon our beloved England?' (*Sermon on Baptismal Regeneration*, July 5, 1864.) The present writer has probably attended many thousand sermons within the Church of England, for every one that Mr. Spurgeon has attended: and he never once, in all his life, heard anything like the doctrines which are here attributed to her preachers; nor has he ever read, in any accredited writer of the Catholic Church, in any language or at any period of Christendom, one single statement that could fairly give occasion to such an enormous misunderstanding. But he has read the following: (1) Tertullian (in the second

Who then is responsible for her having *seemed* to teach them? Is it not we, the clergy of the Church,—who have never taken sufficient pains to point out that the word 'regeneration' is a *technical* expression[43]; that it does not mean the same thing in theology, as it does in the columns of a modern newspaper; that the 'regeneration' of a country or the 'regene-

---

century), *De Baptismo*, cap. 8: 'After the flood the world fell again,.. and is destined for the fire; and so is every man who after Baptism *renews his sins*.' (2) Origen (in the third century) on *S. John*, vol. vi. 133, de la Rue: 'The washing of water, being *a symbol of the cleansing of the soul* washed from all stain of sin, is to him who yieldeth himself.. nothing less than the opening a fountain of divine gifts.' (Cf. Hom. xxii. on *S. Luke*.) (3) Gregory of Nyssa (in the fourth century) on *Isaiah* iii. 18: 'Such should regeneration be: so *efface all intimacy with sin:* such should be the life of the sons of God.' (4) Augustine (in the fifth century), *De Baptismo*, v. 24: 'The sacrament of regeneration comes first; and if they shall preserve Christian piety, *conversion will follow in the heart*, the sign of which preceded on the body.' (5) Aquinas (in the middle ages), *Summa*, iii. 49. 9: 'That any one should be justified by Baptism, it is requisite that *the will of the man embrace* the baptism and its effect.' (6) Hooker (in the sixteenth century) v. 57. 4: 'Sacraments are not *physical* but *moral* means of salvation.' (7) Waterland (in the eighteenth century, —quoted in a catena of forty-one Anglican writers on this subject, in *Tracts for the Times*, No. 76): 'The Holy Spirit translates them out of their state of nature to which a curse belongs, to a *state* of grace, favour, and blessing.' And Archbishop Sharp, *ibid.*: 'We grieve the Holy Spirit,.. when being Christians in profession we will not vouchsafe Him a lodging *in our hearts*.'—These Puritan misunderstandings are however, in Dean Barlow's words (1603), 'Crambe bis [or rather 'centies'] posita;' and, as Dr. Pusey said in 1851, (*Letter to Bishop of London*, fifth edition, p. 195): 'If Tractarianism were what it is popularly depicted to be, none would eschew it with more abhorrence than the writers of the *Tracts*.' (See also a Puritan 'Rejoinder to the Bishops,' 1661, in *Documents on English Puritanism*, p. 318: Pierce, *Vindication of Dissenters*, 1717, p. 147: Towgood, *Dissent Justified*, 1746, twelfth edit., p. 42: Fisher, *Liturg. Purity*, 1857, p. 100: Binney, *Church Life in Australia*, second edition, 1860, p. 59.)

[43] This is at once proved, by the fact that the word is occasionally applied *even to our Lord's baptism:* e. g. by Clem. Alex. *Pæd.* i. 6, and Jerome, *c. Jovin.* i. 'According to these writers, as our Lord's "regeneration" consisted in His being ritually separated to the work which the Father gave Him to do, so ours must consist in our ritual consecration to His service.' (Wall, *on Baptism*, part i. ch. 3): cf. Barrett (*Wesleyan*) *Catholic and Evangelical Principles*, p. 40: and Fisher, *Liturg. Purity*, p. 182. 'The question is manifestly a question of words; and can only be settled by a philological adjustment.' Also Bishop Bethell, *on Baptismal Regeneration*, p. 110; and *English Puritan Documents*, p. 323.

ration' of society is one thing, but the 'regeneration' of an individual in the waters of Baptism is quite another; that it is, in short, nothing less than a second birth, not now into the world, but into the family and household of Jesus Christ; there to be educated, there to come under—at once, and by right as sons—all the healthful elevating influences of His family; and there to grow up, by slow and (it may be) sadly interrupted degrees, to 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ'?

But if our people have heard little or nothing of all this, if the beauty of this most lovely ideal (so full of nature and of common sense) has never dawned upon the ordinary middle-class mind, if for many long years the Baptismal service was virtually withdrawn from public view, and (since its restoration) has been veiled amid a cloud of conceits and mysticisms, drawn from the Christian rhetoricians of the fourth and fifth centuries, —how can we be surprised, that half-instructed people have rejected the truth itself, along with the tinsel dress in which it has been presented to them? How can we pretend to wonder that they have gone astray, and sought in Calvinism some other idea of the Church, which at least they could understand? How can we complain, if the bolder spirits among them have at length broken away, and (in the name of a God of sincerity and truth) have determined that Baptism should at least mean something; and should really *be*—what the Church has, all along, amid her too rhetorical language, meant it to be—viz. the doorway into the family and kingdom of Christ, wherein the Holy Ghost and all His abundant blessings dwell[44]?

[44] Augustine, *Confess.* xiii. § 29, 'Non enim intratur alitèr in regnum cœlorum:' Aquinas, *Summa*, iii. 73. 3, 'Baptismus est principium Spiri-

And now behold how—neglect having generated error—one error draws after it another; and how a slight angle of divergence may, in process of time, become a vast and incurable misunderstanding! On the one hand, the Baptist—recoiling from the vague statements of the Churchman about Baptism,—seeks elsewhere his definition of the Church of the Redeemed. He cannot believe, that those merely who are sprinkled with water, about the *conditions* of whose admission no care whatever is taken, and about whose subsequent *discipline* and training no trouble is expended, form the Church and family of Jesus Christ. He therefore goes in search of some other conception. And he finds it in the (strangely misunderstood) word 'election[45].' He next

talis vitæ et janua sacramentorum:' Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.* iii. 1. 6, 'Entered we are not into the visible Church, before our admittance by the door of baptism.'

[45] When a man has once—whether from his own fault, or from that of others—let go the Catholic faith about 'the Church,' as an external, organized, imperfect, educating society, he is obliged by the necessities of his false position to invent some other theory, and to fit thereto (by the most violent and self-contradictory expedients) the traditional language and customs of Christendom. Thus the Independent defines the Church as 'the whole fellowship of the faithful and holy throughout all places and ages . . invisible . . known in all its extent to the Omniscient eye alone.' (*Ecclesia*, p. 59.) 'The one true Church becomes visible, not in its proper unity under Christ its Head, but under the form of particular congregations or churches.' (*Ibid.* p. 104.) But what possible sense or meaning can the outward act of Infant Baptism hold under such a theory as that?—The Baptist is more logical. He baptizes only those whom he believes to be God's elect. But besides the mistakes to which he is liable, in judging who are God's own people, he has a standing difficulty in dealing with children,—a difficulty which the Church's theory entirely avoids.—The Quaker, feeling all these self-contradictions, repudiates Baptism altogether.—The Wesleyan, rightly shrinking from meddling with God's election, yet unable to accept the old simple doctrine, fixes his attention upon 'sensible conversion' which he supposes to be 'the new birth;' and Baptism immediately sinks into an almost unmeaning ceremony. But, meanwhile, interminable confusion is introduced, by the Church's technical word 'regeneration' being employed to express this abnormal and convulsive crisis. Hence even Wesleyan teachers of high character can bring themselves to write as follows: 'The holding of Baptismal Regeneration in the High Church school precludes the absolute necessity of any subsequent change or renovation of the heart.' (Barrett, *Cath. and Evang.*

learns to ridicule the Church's Baptismal language and ritual, which he has long ceased to understand; proclaims her to be 'the world' under ecclesiastical forms; and at last thinks he doeth God service, by undermining her position and counteracting her influence, in every way he can.

On the other hand, the officers of the Church more and more lost sight of the true meaning of her Rites. They gradually allowed her discipline to become confused and to fall into desuetude. The guarantees she once took, the sponsorships she once so anxiously imposed,—as the only condition on which she would admit (what her yearning heart could not forbid) the bringing of little speechless infants within her baptismal lines,—were suffered to become a dead letter[46]. And then too, her safeguard, her second line of defence, her 'consummation' and 'sealing' of what perchance his presbyters or deacons had too lightly done, by the Bishop's more leisurely *confirming* hand[47],—this most beautiful and happy thought too became spoiled and neglected[48]:

---

*Principles* (1843), p. 121),—the truth being, as every Churchman knows, precisely the reverse.

[46] How closely on this, and a hundred other subjects, a really *thoughtful* Wesleyan approaches the Church, perhaps it hardly needed the following citation to show: 'For an infant-baptism to take place without assurance being given on the part of the parents, or others, that the child shall be brought up in the ordinances and under the teaching of the regenerating [renewing] Word, this is only to mock an institution which binds all parties concerned.' (Barrett, *Principles*, p. 128.)

[47] Tertullian (A.D. 200), *De Bapt.* § 7: 'Egressi de lavacro perungimur benedictâ unctione . . Dehinc manus imponitur.' Cyprian (A.D. 250), *Epist.* 72: 'Qui in ecclesiâ baptizantur Præpositis ecclesiæ offeruntur, et . . signaculo dominico consummantur.' Constit. Apost. (A.D. 300) iii. 16: Μετὰ τοῦτο ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος χριέτω τοὺς βαπτισθέντας τῷ μύρῳ . . Τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας. Ambrose (A.D. 380), *De Sacram.* iii. 2: 'Sequitur spiritale signaculum: . . quià post fontem superest ut perfectio fiat.' Jerome (A.D. 400) *c. Lucif.* § 4: 'Non abnuo hanc esse ecclesiarum consuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longè a majoribus urbibus per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati sunt, Episcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus manum impositurus excurrat.' (Cf. Bingham, bk. xii. 1; Neander, i. 438.)

[48] 'We have to acknowledge that in

until 'Confirmation' also came to lose its high baptismal meaning, even to the Churchman himself. And what has it, after all this divergence, come to mean to the Dissenter? It has come to mean simply a rite without sense or reality, without any sufficient Scriptural authority, and which will not fit in to any conception he now possesses as to what the Church is, or what she ought to do[49].

Should we not then, taught even by our foes, take seriously to heart this urgent question of Church Discipline? Can it be right—the Baptist virtually says to us—to admit men by shoals into the Church, and then to take so little trouble about the guarantees and the methods of their spiritual training? Why not rather refuse them? Why not thrust back these unmanageable crowds; narrow the gates, reject the infants[50],

the Church the rust of abuses, and of a mechanical superstition, is always forming afresh . . The right reforming spirit must therefore never depart from the Church.' (Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 18, English translation.)

[49] Two hundred years ago, it seems, the Puritans had not yet lost sight of the beauty and utility of the Church's right of Confirmation. See 'Rejoinder to the Bishops,' 1661, *English Puritan Documents*, p. 331: 'O that we had the primitive Episcopacy, and that Bishops had no more churches to oversee than in the primitive times they had; and then we would never speak against this reservation of Confirmation to the Bishop.'

[50] The first whisper of the exclusion of infants from a full and free admission to the Church and family of Jesus Christ by baptism, is to be found in the gloomy Montanist Tertullian, A.D. 200, (*De Bapt.* § 18): 'Veniant dum adolescunt; veniant dum discunt, dum quò veniant docentur; fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?' His reasons therefore are very different from those of later Puritans, who have confused themselves (1) with Jewish notions, about a covenant made with 'believers and their *seed*,' (2) with pseudo-philosophy, about election and free-will. Cf. 'Rejoinder to the Bishops,' 1661, *English Puritan Documents*, p. 318: 'The covenant of grace that giveth the saving benefits of Christ, is made to none but the faithful and their seed. Will you call this a punishing of them for their fathers' sakes, that God hath extended His mercy to no more? Their parents' infidelity doth but *leave* them in their original sin and misery.' Thank God, the Church of England has ever rejected such dreadful and unchristian sophistries.

restore the Catechumen system, bid men (at length) 'give evidence,' by recounting their feelings and their experiences, that they are spiritually Christians, before they are formally admitted and enrolled as His?

'Nay,' answers the Churchman, 'refuse (in my Master's name) I dare not: narrow I will not: bid men be already Christ's scholars, before I admit them to the school of Christ, I cannot,—lest I bring scorn and derision upon the very educational institution with which I am set in charge. But what I can do, I will do, and must do, for His sake. And this I can do: I can expend more toil and care and management on this vast subject; I can call to mind what the system of "sponsors" really means, what "catechising" really implies, and how the wisdom of antiquity knit up each diocese into unity by gathering all its threads into the Bishop's hands, and especially by calling on him to review and seal by "Confirmation" all the Baptismal admissions given by his priests and deacons in his absence. And if it be desirable (as it is most urgently desirable) to bring before my countrymen's very eyes—who have too long been enslaved to a mere bald and prosaic common sense—the beautiful and meaning rites of my Church, in their most plain and speaking forms, I will take advantage of the perilous and disgraceful fact, that thousands in every English town are actually unbaptized, to let down Christ's net visibly among them. I will seek them first by home missions. Those who offer themselves I will train previously as Catechumens. And then I will present before the assembled Church the spectacle of a Baptism in its highest and most normal form: not indeed by immersion,—in that point the Church's freedom must be unflinchingly maintained, in order *to teach the spirituality of the Lord's*

*sacraments*, by using the drop of water and the fragment of bread, to represent the "Regenerating Bath[51]" and the Eucharistic Feast,—but by placing the adult and instructed convert before the whole "congregation of Christ's flock," and then admitting him publicly,—both by Baptism and (if possible) by Confirmation also,—to all the privileges of a Christian.'

If the Baptists,—even by their deeply to be regretted and mistaken separation,—shall have taught the Church, or reminded her of, some of these truths, their testimony will not have been thrown away nor their sufferings in the olden time have been in vain. And if God would grant them, or those (at least) of them who are the most loosely attached to Calvinism, such grace of charity, humility, and brotherly-love, as should whisper in their consciences—'*the Church of Christ thou mayest not thus lightly rend: not "he that defileth," but "he that destroyeth* (φθείρει) *the Church of God, him* (*saith the Apostle*) *shall God destroy:" and therefore to strengthen the Church with what thou hast to contribute of truth and earnestness, not to weaken it by withdrawing them and thyself from her service,—this is thy bounden duty to thy Lord*,'—I believe that the return of such men to an honoured place within her ranks, would be as when brothers are reconciled after a long estrangement. The hands once clasped, the mutual confession of past sins, hasty words, of passionate deeds, once honestly made,—a thousand causes of misunderstanding would at once be cleared away. And—instead of bitter rivalry, and the devilish spirit of jealousy and hate,—union and concord might once more produce their miraculous effects upon the heathen, as of old; effects as dear to

[51] The 'lavacrum regenerationis,' Iren. v. 15, 3.

the heart of our Baptist brethren, as they are to our own, and expressly promised by our Lord Himself on condition of ecclesiastical unity, when He prayed 'that they may be ONE in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent ME[52].'

[52] John xvii. 21.

# APPENDIX G.

## *The Baptist Confessions of Faith.*

[The first is a form drawn up, in 1646, by seven Congregations in London, 'for vindicating of the truth . . and taking off those aspersions which are frequently—both in pulpit and print—unjustly cast upon them.' The second Confession (modelled on the 'Westminster Confession') was published in 1677; and was afterwards reprinted, with approval and recommendation from more than a hundred congregations, in 1689. The former is to be found in Neal (Toulmin's edition), iii. 559: the latter was republished, in 1863, by Mr. Spurgeon. In both cases, I have only given what seemed of special importance or interest.]

### *The first 'Confession' (in fifty-two Articles)*: 1646.

'(I.) The Lord our God is but one God, whose subsistence is in Himself . . (II.) In this divine and infinite Being there is the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided . . (III.) . . God hath, before the foundation of the world, foreordained some men to eternal life through Jesus Christ, to the praise and glory of His grace: leaving the rest in their sin, to their just condemnation, to the praise of His justice . . . (VIII.) The rule of this knowledge, faith, and obedience, concerning the worship of God,—in which is contained the whole duty of man,—is (not men's laws, or unwritten traditions, but) only the Word of God contained in the Scriptures; . . which are the only rule of holiness and obedience for all saints, at all times, in all places to be observed . . (XXI.) Jesus Christ by His death did purchase salvation for the elect that God gave unto Him; these only have interest in Him and fellowship with Him . . The free gift of eternal life is given to them, and none else . . (XXIII.) All those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit, can never finally nor totally fall away . . . (XXXIII.) The Church is a company of visible saints, called and separated from the world by the Word and Spirit of God, to the visible profession of the faith of the Gospel; being baptized into that faith . . (XXXV.) And all His servants . . are to lead their lives in this walled sheepfold and watered garden, . . to supply each other's wants, inward and outward . . (XXXVI.) Being thus joined, every Church hath power given them from

Christ, for their well-being to choose among themselves meet persons for elders and deacons . . and none have power to impose on them either these or any other . . (XXXIX.) Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, given by Christ, to be dispensed upon persons *professing faith*, or that are made disciples; who, upon profession of faith, ought to be baptized and after to partake of the Lord's Supper . . (XL.) The way and manner of dispensing this ordinance, is *dipping or plunging the body under water*. It, being a sign, must answer the things signified; which is, that interest the saints have in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and that as certainly as the body is buried under water, and risen again, so certainly shall the bodies of the saints be raised by the power of Christ, in the day of the resurrection, to reign with Christ. (XLVIII.) . . We acknowledge with thankfulness, that God hath made this present king and parliament honourable in throwing down the prelatical hierarchy . . and concerning the worship of God, there is but one lawgiver . . Jesus Christ; who hath given laws and rules sufficient, in His Word, for His worship; and to make any more, were to charge Christ with want of wisdom or faithfulness, or both . . . It is the magistrates' duty to tender the liberty of men's consciences . . without which all other liberties will not be worth the naming . . Neither can we forbear the doing of that, which our understandings and consciences bind us to do. And if the magistrates should require us to do otherwise, we are to yield our persons in a passive way to their power . . . (The conclusion.) Thus we desire to give unto Christ that which is His . . . Also we confess, that we know but in part, and that we are ignorant of many things which we desire and seek to know. And if any shall do us that friendly part, to shew us from the Word of God that we see not, we shall have cause to be thankful to God and to them. But if any man shall impose on us anything that we see not to be commanded by our Lord Jesus Christ, we should rather . . die a thousand deaths, than to do anything . . against the light of our own consciences.'

*The second 'Confession' (in thirty-two chapters)*: 1689.

'(I.) The Holy Scripture is the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving knowledge, faith, and obedience . . Nothing is at any time to be added, whether by new revelation of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that . . there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed . . The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself . . (II.) . . In this divine and infinite Being there are three subsistences . . which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of

all our communion with God, and comfortable dependence on Him. (III.) By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated or fore-ordained to eternal life . . others being left to act in their sin to their just condemnation . . . (X.) . . Infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit; who worketh when, where, and how He pleaseth; so also are all elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word. Others, not elected, though they may be called by the ministry of the Word . . neither will nor can truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved . . (XIV.) The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe . . is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word; by which also, and by the administration of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, prayer, and other means appointed of God, it is increased and strengthened . . . (XXVI.) The Catholic or universal Church, which (with respect to the internal work of the spirit and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect . . The officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church . . are bishops or elders, and deacons . . It is incumbent on the Churches to whom they minister, to communicate to them of all their good things, according to their ability; so as they may have a comfortable supply, without being themselves entangled in secular affairs . . . (XXIX.) Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament . . Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience to, our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance . . Immersion, or dipping of the person in water, is necessary to the due administration of that ordinance. (XXX.) . . All ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Christ, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table.

# LECTURE V.

## THE QUAKERS.

A.D. 1646.

*Leading Idea:*—Spirituality of the Church.

*Method adopted:*—Abandonment of all external ritual whatsoever.

'Ad hanc ergò interiorem vocem aures cordis erigi admonemus; ut loquentem Deum intùs audire, quàm foris hominem, studeatis.. Nec sanè laborandum est, ut ad vocis hujus perveniatur auditum. Labor est potiùs aures obturare ne audias.' (S. Bernard, *de Conversione*, cap. i.)

## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

150. Montanism appears in Asia Minor.
1200. Manichæanism, in South Europe.
1350. Wicliffe; and pre-Reformation Mystics.
1552. Preludes to Quakerism, in France, &c.

---

1646. George Fox (æt. 22) appears in public.
1653. Persecutions, in England and America.
1654. First preaching in London (Howgill.)
1655. First preaching in Ireland, and on the Continent.
1656. Fanaticism at Bristol, &c. (James Naylor.)
1660. Charles II. promises them toleration.
— Venner's insurrection causes severities.
1666. William Penn becomes a Quaker.
— New central Meeting House in Gracechurch-street.
1669. First 'Yearly Meeting' in London.
1672. Charles II.'s Declaration of Indulgence: accepted by Quakers.
1676. Wilkinson and Story's secession; they object to discipline.
— Barclay's Apology published in Latin.
— Great controversies with Baptists.
1681. Pennsylvania granted to William Penn.
1689. Toleration Act.
1816. 'Peace Society' established.
1827. Hicks-ites secede; holding Socinian views.
1828. Test Act repealed.
1833. Abolition of the slave trade.
1837. 'Evangelical Friends' secede, in London
1845. Mrs. Fry ('the female Howard') died.

# LECTURE V.

## THE QUAKERS.

'The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace.'—1 *Cor.* xiv. 32.

THAT the Church of Christ should perpetually need reformation and cleansing from (what has been well called) the ever-recurring 'rust of superstition,' is no more than all good men, in all ages, have sadly confessed. That zealous and active minds should eagerly desire to set their hands to this work, and be tempted to break up the divine order of the Church in their impatience, to root out the tares without regard to the general interests of the slowly ripening crop, and even to invent new theories altogether and new plans, which God hath never planned and His Church has never acknowledged,—all this is too likely, when we remember what human nature is, and what the science of polity should lead us to expect and prepare for. But that good and Christian men should not only feel the temptation, but should also give way to it, and actually so far lose their self-command as to hold themselves called by Almighty God to break the engine in pieces, because the fire has sunk too low and its work is being imperfectly done,—this is indeed a strange and

melancholy spectacle of human infirmity and self-will. And yet even this too, waste though it seem, is capable of being employed by the great Master of all for the good of His Church in the end.

We are now engaged on a study of the second pair of separatist denominations, which seceded from the Church during that torrid epoch of abnormal growths of every kind,—the seventeenth century. The first pair of Dissenting bodies belonged (you will remember) to the sixteenth century,—viz. the Congregationalists and the Romanists. And they went off from the Church on questions merely of polity and *external* order. The second pair, with which we are now dealing,—the Baptists and the Quakers,—departed from the Church rather on questions of *internal* order, of domestic discipline (so to speak) and especially of ritual; the Baptists being —in their own way, and with their attention fixed exclusively on 'baptism'—the high Ritualistic party among Dissenters, while the Quakers, on the other hand (with whom we are to be occupied to-day), gave way to an almost distempered aversion to ritual and outward expression of every sort and kind, and inscribed on the banner of their very small, but determined and highly influential party, the motto of 'Spirituality[1].'

[1] Cf. Fox, *Journal*, i. 75 (seventh edition, 1852): 'Now as I went to Nottingham, on a first-day in the morning [1649], I espied the great Steeple-house; and the Lord said unto me, "Thou must go and cry against yonder great Idol, and against the worshippers therein." . . The preacher told the people it "was the Scriptures, by which they were to try all doctrines, religions, opinions." Now the Lord's power was so mighty upon me, and so strong in me, that I could not hold, but was made to cry out and say, "O no, it is not the Scriptures!" and I told them what it was, viz. the *Holy Spirit*, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures.' And *ibid.* p. 110, a similar scene at Pickering, in Yorkshire.—Penn, *No Cross no Crown*, p. 92. Pride set men 'first at work to pervert the *spirituality* of the Christian worship.'—Barclay, *Apology*, p. 219: 'We judge it our duty, to hold forth that pure and *spiritual* worship, which is acceptable to God.'—Evans, *Exposition*, p. x. [an American authorized work, 1827]: 'The peculiar views which

Let us earnestly and candidly endeavour to see what they meant, and whether the word they have thus spoken be not indeed a word of God, and well worthy the attention of the Christian Church and of every Christian man,—though it be not spoken through the regular and accredited organs of the divinely constituted Society.

Quakerism (as we all know) was founded by George Fox. And it gained its strange name from one of his casual expressions about 'fearing and quaking at the word of the Lord[2].' The name however by which they entitle themselves is that of 'Friends[3].' George Fox was a religious enthusiast, of pure life, imposing personal appearance and manner, and of unimpeachable sincerity. He appeared in the second quarter of the seventeenth century,—a time when the very foundations both of Church and State were being shaken. For, born within a few months of the day when Charles I. succeeded to his difficult inheritance, at his humble home in Leicestershire he must have witnessed the gathering of that fearful storm, which plunged the

the Society entertained of the *Spiritual* nature of the Gospel dispensation, rendered its members obnoxious to much opposition.'—Spurgeon, *Lecture on George Fox*, p. 1: 'It seemed to me, esteemed Friends, that you were a picked body of men, peculiarly set apart to be the advocates of a *spiritual* religion.'—*Quakerism and the Church: being my reasons for leaving the Society of Friends*, p. 6 (1870): 'There remains the grand principle which distinguishes the Society of Friends from all other Churches or sects, and which they are accustomed to sum up under the expression of "the entire *spirituality* of the Gospel dispensation." This idea has led to the rejection of the outward ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.'

[2] *Journal*, i. 85. Marsden, *Dict. of Sects*, p. 423.—'God had visibly clothed him with a divine preference and authority; and indeed his very presence expressed a religious majesty: yet he never abused it.' (Penn's *Preface to Fox's Journal*, p. 34.)

[3] 'The Society are called "Quakers" by the world; but are known to each other by the name of "Friends,"—a beautiful appellation, and characteristic of the relation which man, under the Christian dispensation, ought uniformly to bear to man.' (Clarkson, *Portraiture of Quakerism*, i. p. viii.)

whole realm of England into chaos[4]: and which, concentrating all its violence in those midland counties, issued in the King's defeat at Naseby and his final surrender at Southwell in 1646. Charles surrendered on May 5th, and armed men throughout England rested awhile on their swords; while the Puritan party everywhere rejoiced, for it seemed that at last their hour of triumph had come, that the Reformation would at length receive its completion, Scotch Presbyterianism be established throughout the country, and our Church be assimilated (as they expressed it) to the best and most thoroughly reformed Churches on the Continent.

But all this (happily) was not to be. When men raise the flag of rebellion and secession, it is not always lowered precisely at that point where the success of just their own schemes has been secured. There are other schemers now in the field, besides them. There are other theories, more advanced ideas, more reckless fanaticisms, which have dawned upon men's minds during the conflict. And these will not give way, when the persons who originally drew the sword give the signal that it is time to sheathe it. This is the history of all 'revolutions,' whether in Church or State. And so it happened that, on the very same May morning when King Charles was surrendering his sword to the Presbyterian Scots,—not a hundred miles away there was a young man, wandering gloomily in the fields at Coventry[5], and

[4] 'The English nation was at this period (1650) much engrossed with the great subjects of religion and politics, and both were mingled together in strange conjunction.' (Fox, *Journal*, i. 94, note.) 'A mad and confused scene.' (Burnet, *Own Times*, book i. sub fin.)

[5] 'In the year 1646, on the 1st of May, while he was walking in the fields [near Coventry], he had, he believed, a divine revelation . . He therefore retired to fields and orchards, and studied his Bible alone.' (Marsden, *Dict. of Sects*, p. 421; Fox, *Journal*, i. 52.) Charles I. surrendered on May 5.

brooding over thoughts which were destined to carry on the work then one stage completed, not merely to a second, but a *third* stage in advance; and whose task it was—when Baptists and Independents had superseded Presbyterianism—to supersede them in turn by a pure ultra-spiritualism.

This young man was George Fox. He was the son of a weaver, a solitary shepherd and cattle-drover by employment, and of an innocent, serious, devout disposition. But he was touched and (it is impossible to doubt) a little thrown off his balance by religious enthusiasm[6]. He had for three years left his home and employment, 'broken off (as he tells us) all familiarity or fellowship with old and young,' and wandered about the country with the Bible in his pocket, seeking peace and mental satisfaction from the Clergy and from Dissenters of all denominations,—but finding none. For even in London, the head-quarters of Puritanism and Dissent, he says, 'all was dark and under the chain of darkness[7].'

What did he mean? He meant, I think, that a great and majestic truth was dawning within him and struggling outwards into the perfect day; but that none of the narrow sects, and none (I am afraid) of the men who then too often mis-represented the Catholic Church of England, were able either to understand or to assist him to bring it forth. There were, however, very few of the regular clergy to whom he opened his heart,—not more, it seems, than two or three: for he was much

[6] 'At the command of God, in the ninth day of the seventh month, 1643, I left my relations and broke off all familiarity with old or young.' (*Journal*, i. 50.) 'I was often under great temptations; I fasted much, and often took my Bible and sat in hollow trees and lonesome places.' (*Ibid.* p. 54.)

[7] *Journal*, i. 51.

more drawn to the Dissenters[8]. And we cannot doubt that, had he found out a Jeremy Taylor, a George Herbert, or a Joseph Hall, instead of some miserable priest at Mancetter, who bade the youth 'take tobacco and sing psalms[9],' Quakerism would never have been born; and its noble energy and pure essential Christianity might have gone rather to enliven and spiritualize the Church, whose true meaning (in so many ways) it unconsciously expresses.

This majestic truth was, in few words, that department of the Church's creed, which was not then,—nay, I am bold to say, which is not *now*,—brought out into its full and proper significance, *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*: viz. 'I believe in the HOLY GHOST, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who, with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets.' The theology of those days (remember), from the Reformation onwards, had been a mere play of logic and word-fence around the profoundest subjects. The reign of scholasticism had never really come to an end. Words and notions, not things and facts, had been hitherto the subject of endless, weary, unprofitable controversy[10].

---

[8] 'After I had received that opening from the Lord, that "to be bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not sufficient to fit a man to be a minister of Christ," I regarded the priests less, and looked more after the Dissenting people. Among them I saw there was some tenderness. . . But as I had forsaken the priests, so I left the separate preachers also, and those esteemed the most experienced people: for I saw there was none among them all that could speak to my condition. When all my hopes in them, and in all men, were gone . . then, oh then, I heard a voice which said, "There is one, even Jesus Christ, that can speak to thy condition;" and when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy.' (*Journal*, i. 55.)

[9] *Journal*, i. 52.

[10] Cf. Fox, *Journal*, i. 61 (1647): 'The Lord opened it to me, that people and professors trampled upon the *life*, even the life of Christ; they fed upon *words*, and fed one another with words.'—Barclay, *Apology*, p. ix. (1675): 'The world is even burdened with the great and voluminous

Calvinism and its childish philosophy about the Divine decrees, Puritanism and its senseless prattle about the vestments of Baal and the dregs of Rome, Romanism and its subtle, scarcely honest, verbiage about transubstantiation, Laudianism and its petty tyrannical enforcement of uniformity *in minimis*,—oh, the world was weary of them all. And the time was ripe for one to arise who should dare, in his simplicity, to take with him the Bible apart into the fields and see what God had really *meant* by a revelation,—'holy indeed and just and good,'—but which seemed to have been so hopelessly buried amid this heap of Rabbinical rubbish and scholastic refinements, that nothing short of beginning from the beginning once more, and stripping the Gospel absolutely bare of all its intolerable makebelieves and hypocrisies, seemed a fitting remedy for the mischief.

Behold, accordingly, this childlike soul, this babe in Christ, this man of one book—but that book the Bible, —step forth amid the confused Babel that called itself English Christianity in the seventeenth century[11], to bear testimony in the name of God to the inner truth and meaning of all these things that the sects were battling over. He thought himself a prophet, a 'Nabi,' like one of those in the Old Testament[12]. And, for my

tractates which are made about it [God's truth], and by their vain jangling and commentaries, by which it is rendered a hundredfold more dark and intricate than of itself it is; which great learning, so accounted of—to wit, your *school divinity* (which taketh up almost a man's whole lifetime to learn), brings not a whit nearer to God.'

[11] Fox first appeared in public in 1646; and 'without all question,' says Neal (*Puritans*, ii. 425), 'both Church and State were in the utmost disorder and confusion at the close of this year.'

[12] This was precisely the Montanist feeling, in the second century. 'By bringing forward an Old Testament *prophetic* order, it formed a check against mingling the Old Testament *priesthood* with the Christian standpoint.' (Neander, *Antignost.* p. 202; Bohn.) And it is curious that the great Montanist, Tertullian, in some respects resembles George Fox.

own part, I will not undertake to say he was not. For his 'heart was hot within him; and at last he spake with his tongue.' And if, in his early days, he was guilty of extravagances which he afterwards regretted; if his followers (especially when all the sects combined to persecute them) became still more heated, fanatical, insolent; and if both he and they (buoyed up by an enthusiasm which for a time overcame the natural and healthy action of common-sense) bade adieu to all the established customs and decent conventionalities of the world,—such conduct, under the strange circumstances of the Commonwealth, was not, perhaps, wholly unpardonable. It is by such weak things, and by the ignoble, ignorant persons, the 'babes and sucklings' (as William Penn reminds us[13]), that God's greatest works are oftentimes accomplished for mankind.

No: it is not in the affirmations of George Fox, but (as usually is the case) in his *denials*, that the Church of Christ meets him and repudiates his teaching; tells him plainly that his system is no system to bear the wear and tear of time; that even his warnings against externalism were but temporary truths, local truths, half truths,—not the eternal, catholic, solid and many-sided verities of the Gospel by which men live: and that when

---

'Tertullian's mind had acuteness, depth, and dialectic dexterity; but no logical clearness, repose, and arrangement. It was profound and fruitful, but not harmonious: the check of sober self-government was wanting.' (*Ibid.* p. 206.)

[13] 'He was a man that God endued with a clear and wonderful depth, a discerner of others' spirits, and very much a master of his own. And though the side of his understanding which lay next to the world, and especially the expression of it, might sound uncouth and unfashionable to nice ears, his matter was, nevertheless, very profound. . . so that I have many times been overcome in myself, and been made to say, with my Lord and Master upon the like occasion, "I thank Thee, O Father, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent of this world, and revealed them to babes."' (Penn, *Preface to Fox's Journal*, p. 30.)

they were coupled with downright denials of the *other* side of truth, negations of what wiser saints of God than he, and far broader societies of Christians than his, had held most sacred and indispensable for spiritual growth —then (and not till then) he had fallen into error and was on the way to schism, and so on the way to weaken and shatter still farther the Church of his Master Christ, which he was sincerely and devoutly anxious to build up.

For it was not long, before that which he had begun as a mere 'Society of Friends,' organized and settled itself (especially when it fell under the guidance of more educated men, like Barclay and Penn) into a sect or—as the fashionable nomenclature now is—a 'Church.' Terrible were the persecutions it underwent, in America from the Independents, and from all the sects alike in England. But it thought scorn of all these things. And after arranging its own discipline by an ably-devised, though very bald and prosaic, system of 'meetings,' it has since been able, with the most extraordinary success, to infuse the spirit and essence of George Fox's teaching into the very veins (as it were) of the modern world [14]. It has all but put down slavery: it is on its way, I hope, to put down war [15].

But let us hear now, from his own pen and those of his best-accredited followers, what his doctrines were. At the very first opening of his career, the simplicity

[14] It is curious that the same thing has to be said of its correlative denomination in primitive times. 'Although the sect and its subdivisions continued to flourish for a time . . the chief success of Montanism was gained in another way—by infusing much of its character into the Church.' (Robertson, *Church Hist.* i. 77.)

[15] To what strange lengths, in the opposite direction, does the almost Antichristian worship of mere mechanical centralization and efficiency lead some Romanists! E.g. De Maistre (*Soirées*, ii. 16) actually says: 'Rien ne s'accorde dans ce monde, comme l'esprit religieux et l'esprit militaire.'

of the man is quite amazing. He had evidently never once heard the veriest στοιχεῖα and commonplaces of the Catholic teaching of the Church. 'As I was walking in a field on a first-day morning,' says he, 'the Lord opened unto me, "that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ:" and I wondered at it; because it was the common belief of people. But I saw it clearly as the Lord opened it to me, and was satisfied, and admired the goodness of the Lord[16].' Now we may smile at this; and say (what is perfectly true) that this is simply the teaching of the Catholic Church from the very beginning; and that if George Fox had only opened that not very uncommon book—the English Prayer-book—he would have found it set down in very large and distinct characters indeed[17]. But then, let

[16] *Journal*, i. 53.

[17] The slightest acquaintance with the history and literature of the Church will abundantly confirm this statement. See, e.g. (1) Chrys. (A.D. 381) *De Sacerdot.* iii. 7: 'If it be enough simply to be called "pastor," and to undertake the duty at hap-hazard, and there be no danger in so doing, —then accuse me, if you will, of levity [in shrinking from the ministry]. But if there be need of a ready intellect, and (a long way before intellect) of much grace from God, of uprightness of *character*, of pureness of life, and of virtue greater than belongs to unassisted man,—then deny me not your sympathy.' (2) Aug. (A.D. 400) *de Doctr.* iv. 27: 'Habet (ut obedientèr audiatur) quantâcunque granditate dictionis majus pondus—*vita* dicentis... Abundant enim, qui malæ vitæ suæ defensionem ex ipsis suis Præpositis et Doctoribus quærant.' (3) Greg. I. (A.D. 600) *de Pastorali Curâ*, ii. 1: 'Sit ergò, necesse est, cogitatione mundus, actione præcipuus, discretus in silentio, utilis in verbo, .. benè agentibus per humilitatem socius, contrà delinquentiam vitia per zelum justitiæ erectus, internorum curam in exteriorum occupatione non minuens, exteriorum providentiam in internorum sollicitudine non relinquens.' (4) Bernard (A.D. 1150) *de Conversione, ad Clericos*, cap. xix: 'Væ vobis, qui clavem tollitis non scientiæ solùm, sed et auctoritatis! Tollitis enim, et non accipitis, claves. . . Mundicordes utique vocat Pater cœlestis; qui non quærunt quæ sua sunt, sed qui Jesu Christi. . . Væ ministris infidelibus, qui necdum reconciliati reconciliationis alienæ negotia apprehendunt! Væ filiis iræ, qui se ministros gratiæ profitentur!' (5) A Pan-Anglican Council, under Cardinal Otho (A.D. 1237), Lyndwood, p. 16: Johnson, *English Canons*, i. 155: 'The sacred order is therefore to be conferred upon worthy men

us reflect. Here was a man of the people, who apparently had been a Churchman up to the age of twenty, but who had (it seems) never once been taught these things. He had most probably never once had the solemnities of ordination brought within his view; and he testifies that the 'common belief of people' at that time was the gross and incredible parody of the Church's teaching about the ministry—that a University degree was all that was required to enable a man to preach the Gospel and undertake the cure of souls! I blush to think how secular, how dead, how mechanical, how official, the Church must have seemed to such a man—and to thousands such as he—when such were the results of the popular teaching of her clergy.

---

and in a worthy manner. . . Since it is perilous to ordain unworthy persons, we enact that a diligent inquiry be made by the Bishop before ordination.' (6) Provincial synod of Canterbury, under Abp. Reynolds (A.D. 1322), Lyndwood, p. 47: 'Let none be admitted to officiate, unless it be first ascertained, that they be properly ordained, of pure life, and of sufficient learning.' (7) The English Ordinal, (a) *Pontif. Sarisb.*: 'Quantùm ad humanum spectat examen—naturâ, scientiâ et moribus, digni habentur:' (b) Prayer-book of 1549, &c.: 'Take heed that the persons whom ye present to us, be apt and meet for their learning and godly conversation, to exercise their ministry. . . Do you trust you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost? . . Will you apply all your diligence, to frame and fashion your own lives, according to the doctrine of Christ?' (8) The Thirty-nine Articles (A.D. 1552), Art. 26: 'It appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they . . be deposed.' (9) [We now come to the seventeenth century, George Fox's own time]: A.D. 1604, the Canons (now in force) imperatively require assurance of 'a good life and conversation,' in candidates for orders. (10) A.D. 1632, George Herbert writes (*Country Parson*, ch. ii): 'Think not, when they have read the Fathers or Schoolmen, a minister is made, and the thing is done. The greatest and hardest preparation is *within*.' (11) A.D. 1633, Charles I. and Abp. Laud issue instructions, to each bishop personally, 'That there be a special care taken by them all, that their ordinations be solemn and not of unworthy persons.' (Wilkins, *Concil.* iv. 480.) (12) A.D. 1634, a Synod at Dublin is again imperative in demanding assurance of 'a good life and conversation.' (*Ibid.* p. 503.) (13) A.D. 1640. the two Convocations of Canterbury and York solemnly 'require all those, to whom the government of the clergy is committed, . . to reform all scandalous and offensive persons, if any be in the ministry; as they will answer to God.'—Surely, then, it did not require a special revelation to George Fox to inform the Church that mere intellectual qualifications were not sufficient for a clergyman.

But now, unfortunately, instead of feeling an impulse towards improving the Church, instead of inquiring whether her own beautiful sacraments and formularies did not of themselves bear witness to higher things than her clergy at that time taught,—the very first thought that occurred to good men, in those miserable Puritan times, was that of *secession* from the Church. Fox, therefore, instantly determined, on the strength of this amazing revelation, to go to Church no more. 'What should I follow these for? So neither these, nor any of the Dissenting people could I join with; but was a stranger to all, relying wholly upon the Lord Jesus Christ.' Indeed he seems to have been far more averse to the Dissenting 'professors,' than he was to the Church; and thought them by far the greatest deceivers of all. The priests of the Church, (he says,) 'though they stood in deceit and acted by the dark power, . . yet they were not the greatest deceivers spoken of in the Scriptures. . . But the Lord opened to me who the greatest deceivers were, . . such as could speak by experience of God's miracles and wonders. . . These that could speak so much of their experiences of God, and yet turned from the Spirit and the Word, and went unto the gainsaying. These were, and would be, the greatest deceivers, far beyond the priests[18].'

(1.) We see, I think, at once of what this man's mind is in travail; though he finds such difficulty in expressing himself intelligibly. His first great doctrine is this, (and it is also the doctrine of the Catholic Church): that the visible and outwardly organized Church,—with all her hierarchy, her canons, her ritual, her creeds, her sacraments,—is nothing more than the shell (as it were) of the

[18] *Journal*, i. 67.

living creature, the scaffolding of the real building, *the means and not the end*, the casket and not the jewel. He points out how prone men are to forget this fact, and to value the outside case for its own sake; and so, either to love the Church's paraphernalia, for æsthetic and *imaginative* reasons rather than the true one[19]; or, on the other hand, to be enamoured of (so-called) 'schemes of salvation,' bodies of divinity, and elaborate confessions of faith, rather for the *intellectual* pleasure they afford, than for the higher reason that these things may be made the helps and framework of the spiritual life[20].

It surely need not be said that every word of this is true; that it is really (had George Fox but known it) the teaching of the Catholic Church from the beginning. At least, it may be confidently asked, what accredited Church author, of any age or country, has taught otherwise? Who has ever maintained the heathenish superstition, that the framework of the Church, and (as it were) the boards and sockets and pins of the tabernacle, were sacred in God's eyes for their own sake; that the official hierarchy and priesthood were aught but the 'Servi servorum Dei;' or that the very highest rituals

[19] 'At another time it was opened to me, "that God, who made the world, did not dwell in temples made with hands." This, at first, seemed a strange word; because both priests and people used to call their temples or churches "dreadful places," "holy ground," and the "temples of God."' (Fox, *Journal*, i. 53.) '"Alas, poor man," said I, "dost thou call the steeple-house the Church? The Church is the people, whom God hath purchased with His blood,—and not the house."' (*Ibid.* p. 113.)

[20] 'I told them, that this was the word of the Lord God unto them,—that they lived in *words:* but God Almighty looked for fruits amongst them.' (Fox, *Journal*, i. 104.) 'The priest (who was a Baptist and a chapel-priest) came to oppose; but the Lord confounded him. . . Then the priest out with his Bible, and said it was the Word of God. I told him, it was the words of God, but not God the Word. . . Then he said he would prove it to be a god: so he toiled himself afresh, till he perspired again.' (*Ibid.* p. 151.)

and sacraments were anything in themselves, but '*means* of grace,' 'moral (not physical) instruments' of sanctification, and therefore never performed for their own sakes as if they were so many incantations, pleasing (for some inscrutable reason) to the great Author of our being?

But at the same time, I think it must be honestly confessed, that, at many epochs, these true and Catholic doctrines have not been so openly and prominently *stated* in the Church, as they might and ought to have been. And more especially, in the times which succeeded the revival of learning, and that great awakening of intelligence which has continued in increasing measure down to our own day, surely 'timidity' was far too much mistaken by the clergy for 'prudence:' and when the laity,—no longer 'babes in Christ,'—might well have been made 'friends' and shown all that their Lord doeth, the old system of reserve and the demand of implicit obedience was too long kept up,—lest perchance what was understood might run the risk of being despised, and might produce rebellions in the Church.

But, it appears quite plainly, it is the opposite system that has produced rebellions and schisms without end. Were it not well, therefore, that the Church should condescend to learn this lesson, even from the humble shepherd of Drayton-in-the-Clay: not merely that her own ancient spiritual doctrine about the ministry and sacraments is *true;* but that it were well if the truth were more often *acknowledged* and publicly proclaimed: not merely that the clergy *are* but temporary stewards of Christ's mysteries for a practical purpose, and the Church's 'servants for Jesu's sake;' but that they might advantageously *explain* their status more frequently to the people, and affirm in words—what the mediæval painters never scrupled to do in figures,—

viz. that many of the official hierarchy, who had hypocritically and unwillingly done service, and 'cast out devils in Christ's name,' will be disowned by Him at last, and be found on His left hand at the day of doom.

(2.) The second great doctrine taught by the founder of the Quakers is of an analogous kind. It is the important and much overlooked doctrine of *the universal inward light*, by which he (in common with the Catholic Church) protested against the dreadful heresy of Calvin. There is no thoughtful man, I am persuaded, even in our own day, who has not (amid the 'foolish and unlearned' controversies with which the Church has of late years been distracted) sometimes shuddered at the words,—almost of treason against the inner light of conscience, and of blasphemy against the indwelling Spirit who 'leads men into truth,'—into which the eager defenders of some hotly-contested position have been led by their intemperate zeal. But far more was this the case in earlier times: when, wielding some favourite but broken fragment of the Church's machinery in their hands, the religious combatants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were writhing in defeat or frantic with victory; and (in either case) held the instrument with which they fought dearer than life, truer than the truth itself. Take, for instance, that which is by far the most striking case of all,—the attitude of the Reforming party towards the Holy Scriptures. It is briefly summed up in the well-known aphorism of Chillingworth; 'The Bible is the religion of Protestants.' And so it really came to be. So it really is still, in many a narrow circle where the fresher, freer air of the Catholic teaching of the Church has failed to penetrate.

In those small Dissenting circles (as we have seen in a former Lecture, and as might be substantiated by a

hundred proofs) the Bible,—which is only *one* among the many instruments of grace committed to the faithful usage of the Church,—is wrongly made the sole code of statutes, treasury of doctrines, directory of worship, for the Christian Church. The *conscience*, which is (if anything is) the shrine and vehicle of the spiritual life of the man, is positively crushed out by the superincumbent weight of dead texts and precedents of Scripture, which are unmercifully heaped upon it. He may not breathe, he may not live, he may not believe, he may not pour out his pent-up soul in worship, hope, and love, but precisely in such predetermined grooves as Scripture shall have marked out for him. The experiences of a lifetime lived with God shall go for nothing; the burning thoughts that wake within him in some glorious cathedral or beneath the star-lit sky must count for airy fancies; the certainties that move him altogether, with the full momentum of his being, and carry him (with a faith that hostile arguments can never reach) to Christ, shall be accounted madness and folly,—unless all these things can show their credentials in a text, unless the *life* in Christ can show a literal law to justify it, unless the *experience* can show it has been copied from Acts or Galatians, and the *certainty* can set forth all its logical procedure in terms taken from some Epistle written eighteen hundred years ago, to a people whose very language has ceased to exist.

Surprising and almost anti-Christian bondage! What! a Churchman asks such people in amazement,—has the Lord left us nothing but a Book? Has He armed the Church, His evangelizing society on earth, with no other instrument wherewith to reach men's hearts and souls, than *this?* Are there no other 'sacramenta,' or holy means of grace; no more present, no more living

'oracles of God,' than these? And in particular,—did He mean *nothing* when He promised Christendom 'another Comforter;' or was that 'other Comforter' removed with the inspired Apostles, and the Church ever since been (as it were) 'empty, swept and garnished,' waiting for,—or rather despairing of,—its holy promised guest, who should lead it into truth and peace?

We all know perfectly well, that this has *not* been the teaching of the Catholic Church. She has bidden her sons not fear to recognize, in the gentle whispers of their Christian conscience, in the strong wrestlings of some inward conflict, in the sweet and full conviction of some glorious truth, in the passages of a filial friendly walking with God,—the adorable and neither mute nor insensible presence of the Holy Spirit [21]. She has taught, as

[21] Cf. Augustine, *Confess.* x. 26: 'Ubique, veritas! præsides omnibus consulentibus te, simulque respondes omnibus etiam diversa consulentibus. Liquidè tu respondes; sed non liquidè omnes audiunt. . . Sero te amavi, pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova! Serò te amavi! et ecce intùs eras, ut ego foris et ibi te quærebam.'—*Ibid.* xi. 3: 'Scripsit hoc Moses . . sed unde scirem an verum diceret? Intùs utique mihi, intùs in domicilio cogitationis . . sine strepitu syllabarum diceret, "verum dicit."'—Bernard (A.D. 1150), *Sermo de Convers.* cap. i. [i. 1135. ed. Gaume]: 'Ad hanc ergò interiorem vocem aures cordis erigi admonemus,—ut loquentem Deum intùs audire, quam forìs hominem, studeatis . . Nec sanè laborandum est, ut ad vocis hujus perveniatur auditum: labor est potiùs aures obturare ne audias. Nimirùm vox ipsa se offert, ipsa se ingerit, nec pulsare interìm cessat ad ostia singulorum . . Est enim non tantùm *vox* virtutis, sed et radius *lucis*,—annuntians paritèr hominibus peccata eorum et illuminans abscondita tenebrarum.'—*The Abbey of the Holy Ghost* (A.D. 1350: Early English Text Society, No. 26): 'I here make a book of the religion of the heart,—that is, of the abbey of the Holy Ghost; that all those that may not be bodily in religion [i.e. the monastic life], may be ghostly. A Jesu mercy! Where may this abbey best be found, and this religion? Now certes, nowhere so well as in a place that is called *conscience.* And whoso will be busy to find this holy religion, that may each good Christian man and woman do, that will be busy thereabout.' The whole of this most interesting spiritual allegory is well worth reading.—Bishop Sanderson (A.D. 1634), *Sermons*, i. 205: 'The conscience hath this power over men's wills and actions, by virtue of that unchangeable law of God, which He establisheth by a law of nature in our first creation.'—Campbell, *On the Atonement*, p. 110: 'This power is mainly to be referred to conscience, and the light that is in God from every man. For great as are the obligations of conscience to

St. Paul taught, that the Christian's breast is a shrine, wherein that Holy One (like a Divine Shekinah) dwells. And she has bidden us, above all things, not to quench that light, not to grieve and drive away that guest, not to silence that voice—which intertwined with our prayers reacheth the very heart of God, which mingled with our questionings and studies revealeth the deep things of God, and carrieth us up into the recesses of that Eternal Mind, whose contemplation 'passeth knowledge,' yet 'whom to know is everlasting life[22].'

Yet I fear not to say that within the Church of England, no less than among the Dissenting communions, this doctrine of the Holy Ghost and of His indwelling light has been far too little heard. And therefore, when in the seventeenth century a fragment (as it were) of her substance was thrown off on this account, and began to revolve, not far away, but yet in a separate orbit of its own,—it were well to acknowledge that, even thus too, good may be brought out of evil; that even from a body thus temporarily estranged, some rays, which else would have failed to reach us, may be reflected on our eye; and that no small debt of gratitude is due to one who first (even amid some error and extravagance) recovered for us the true prominence of the third great section of the Nicene Creed.

(3.) Another great doctrine broached by George Fox and the early Quakers is, yet again, a doctrine of the Catholic Church,—which had been obscured or denied by the Puritans of the seventeenth century. If Puritanism be true, if Calvin's philosophy of the ways of God to man be a faithful portraiture of the principles which

Scripture, not less assuredly are the obligations of Scripture to conscience.'

[22] John xvii. 3; cf. Rom. viii. 16, 26; 1 Cor. ii. 10; &c., &c.

govern this universe,—then all that a religious man can do is to lay his hand upon his mouth that speaks, and upon his eyes that see, and to bow to an inscrutable and irresistible Power. God's ways find no response whatever in his heart. God's sovereign decrees wake no adoring sense of justice, or even goodness in his mind; and the Church becomes simply a close society of Heaven's favourites, conscious (in some very suspicious way) of their being such, and therefore safe for ever—on no moral, intelligible, or spiritual grounds, but merely because God *wills* it—from falling back among the horrible mass of a festering and accursed world.

A more complete parody of the truth,—attempting to save the credit of half-a-dozen misinterpreted texts of Scripture, at the expense of all for which Scripture was given and Christ came into the world,—I will be bold to say, never entered into the brain of fallen man to conceive. For it is a mere brain-conception. It is a mere piece of fine-spun logic, and French system-making. It is not itself religion. And hence arises the curious fact, that it may be held, and often is held, by really good men, quite apart from their religion; that it may be lodged in the bare intellect alone; and does not injuriously affect (as we know in a thousand cases it does not) the religious life and heart of the man. But, on the other hand, it *may* very seriously affect it. It may produce, in one word, Pharisaism. And the next logical Stage to that is Antinomianism,—the strong conviction that the Elect of Heaven (being such for good and all) remain such, be they of what moral character they may[23]:

[23] Take the following specimens, from Love's *Sermons* (A.D. 1654), p. 203: 'God, in His eternal counsel, doth commonly make the profane and wicked and the worst of men the objects of His election,—rather than civil, honest men, rather than men of civil and moral conversation

that moral renovation (in short) has nothing really to do with the question :—Religion and morals coming at last to be absolutely divorced one from the other, and a low, imperfect, worldly state being comfortably acquiesced in by the passive and waiting child of God[24].

Against all this, the voice of the Church in England, during the sixteenth century, was all too feebly and doubtfully raised. Perhaps the alliance of Calvin and the foreign Reformers seemed too important, amid her dreadful struggle with Rome, to lose, or even run the risk of losing it. And farther, the deep and spiritual truth, germinating amid all this mass of falsehood, and akin to it, she was too nervously aware of. And (I fear it must also be added) she became ere long too busily engaged in doing the State's work, and in helping to enforce by mere outward methods the magnificent dream of a national religious unity resting on law, instead of resting on persuasion. So that she had little time, and ever diminishing opportunity, for counterbalancing these dangerous errors, by a distinct inculcation of their kindred truths. And so—surely, not in His wrath, but in His mercy,—God provided that here again the perishing truth should be revived by agencies outside the ordinary mechanism of the Church. One arose, a despised and uneducated man, to give testimony against these errors in the following way: 'While I was in prison [at Derby], divers professors came to discourse with me; and I had a sense, before they spoke, that they came to plead for sin and imperfection. I asked

here in the world.' There is a truth, here: but how fearfully exaggerated and open to fatal misuse! Contrast with this John Wesley's admirable sermon 'On the Means of Grace.'

[24] 'I do not find the religious life of men, at this moment, very creditable to them. . . The fatal trait is the divorce between Religion and Morality.' (Emerson, *Conduct of Life*, p. 128.)

them whether they were believers, and had faith? And they said yes .. I replied, if your faith be true it will give you victory over sin and the devil, purify your hearts and consciences, and bring you to please God .. But they could not endure to hear of purity, and of victory over sin and the devil .. At another time a company of professors came; and they began to plead for sin .. I asked them, *what* hope is it you have? Is Christ *in* you, the hope of glory? Doth it purify you, as He is pure? But they could not abide to hear of being made pure here. Then I bid them forbear talking of the Scriptures, which were holy men's words .. For since you plead for impurity and sin, which is of the devil, what have you to do with holy men's words? Now the keeper of the prison, being a high professor, was greatly enraged against me, and spoke very wickedly of me... This was in the year 1650[25].'

It must strike us all, I think, that here is nothing more or less than *the Church's doctrine of sanctity*,—preached unawares by one who had separated from her, to the Calvinists and mixed multitude of 'high professing' Puritans of the seventeenth century. It was (as William Penn justly says) 'not merely in *words* pressing repentance, conversion and holiness; but

[25] Fox, *Journal*, i. 84: cf. *ibid.* 314. At Garshore, in Scotland (1657), 'we had a great meeting; and several professors came to it. Now the priests had frightened the people with the doctrine of Election and Reprobation,—telling them that God had ordained the g eatest part of mankind for hell; and that, let them pray, or preach, or sing, or do what they could, it was all to no purpose, if they were ordained for hell: that God had a certain number elected for heaven, let them do what they would,—as David an adulterer, and Paul a persecutor. I was led to open to the people the falseness and the folly of their priests' doctrines .. Was not Christ a propitiation for the sins of the *whole* world? He died for all men, the ungodly as well as the godly.'—After this, it is strange to see Mr. Spurgeon and other Calvinists make complimentary lectures and speeches to the Quakers,—merely, I fear, to engage them in the proposed crusade against the National Church.

doing it knowingly and experimentally; and directing those to whom he preached to a sufficient principle, and telling them where it is and by what tokens they might know it, and which way they might experience the power and efficacy of it; which is more than theory and speculation[26].'

Yes! this is precisely what the great Catholic teachers of the Church have always taught, it is what her glorious symbols *mean*, it is what she has ever spoken in poetry while the Quakers (and similar good people) say the same thing in prose. So that there was really no need to go *out* of the Church to teach all this. What was urgently wanted, and what Christ (I think) was really commissioning George Fox and others to do, was not a *destructive* but rather a *constructive* work,—the work of breathing fresh life into old forms, recovering the true meaning of old symbols, raising from the dead old words that needed translating into modern equivalents[27]. For this is just the work that a 'Clergy,' of whatever denomination, always finds it so very hard to do. 'Traditionalism,'—which, in its due measure, is the same thing in the Church as 'loyalty' is in the State,—when it runs into excess, easily hardens into 'officialism.' And then ere long it takes on a new and spurious life; acquires a fresh and disastrous anti-Christian power of its own; and becomes, in short, an active superstition. Yet a Clergy ought, surely, to know when it is time,—

[26] Preface to *Journal*, i. 21.

[27] Cf. *Edinburgh Review*, October 1866, art. vi. on *Ecce Homo*. 'What has the author done? He has simply translated the dead formulæ of orthodoxy into the living language of modern thought and of men of the world. That is to say, he has presented Christianity in the only shape in which men will receive it at the present day.'—This is the urgent task, the paramount duty, of the living Church, in our own and in every age. With true wisdom has it been said, 'it is not by *rejecting* what is formal, but by *interpreting* it, that we advance in true spirituality.' (*The Patience of Hope*, p. 70.)

not indeed (God forbid!) to *sweep away* old precious historical rites and forms, that touch the man of education so profoundly,—but *to explain and translate them:* and to recognize—if it really be so—that the age of childhood and poetry is at an end, and that the reign of prose has begun. Else how can they speak home to the age of prose? How can they preach Christ intelligibly to it? How can they gild and refine and elevate it, once more, to the higher and truer poetry that comes of maturity and cultivation[28]? No; they will rather be rejected by the laity, as speaking enigmas and trifling with unrealities. Serious sects will arise, without end,—to whom all symbol is an abomination. And so all the lovely play and cross-lights of her many-coloured ritual, will—by our fault, by our infatuated and unintelligent apathy—be misunderstood and cast away by a half-taught middle-class, who (more than any other) need the Church, and are perhaps needed by her.

(4.) And this brings me to the fourth and last point, which I have time to speak of here, as characteristic of the teaching of George Fox and the Quakers: and that is, their *denials;* the negative part of their doctrine; and especially their unhappy mistakes about the Sacraments. The whole of their teaching, no doubt, hangs together; and all has a tendency towards a Gnostic ultra-spiritualism, of which the Church has had plentiful experience in all ages, and whose ultimate results she knows too well. But here we emerge, at length, into a department of Quaker doctrine which is pure

[28] How wonderfully has George Fox caught this true characteristic of the genuine shepherd of souls! 'I cried to the Lord, saying, "Why should I be thus, seeing I was never addicted to commit these evils?" And the Lord answered, "That it was needful I should have a sense of all conditions; how else could I speak to all conditions!" And in this I saw the infinite love of God.' (*Journal*, i. 60.)

and simple denial. It is obvious, indeed, that the notion of the 'inward light,' the direct and immediate illumination by the Holy Ghost, may very easily lead (if pushed too far) to a displacement of doctrinal balance. It suggests to a proud and headstrong mind, a contempt for all *media*, all 'means of grace.' It thinks itself able to do without them. Possibly it is able. For St. Augustine himself allowed that there were high states of religious consciousness, when a man (for instance) who had used the Scriptures till their inspiration became (as it were) a very part of himself, was able to dispense with the Scriptures. He had climbed up by a ladder; and then needed not the ladder. He had built the house so far, that the work of the scaffolding was done[29].

We must not therefore deny that *possibly*, conceivably, it may be so. Else we shall put ourselves and our cause into a false position; and shall be unable to deal with those very striking expressions of George Fox, which remind one so vividly of a greater man than he, who lived 1400 years before him. 'No one (said Origen) can rightly read St. John, who has not lain with him on Jesus' breast[30].' 'I saw plainly (says Fox) that none could read Moses aright, without Moses' spirit . . . Nor could they know the words of Christ and His Apostles, without His Spirit. But as man comes through, by the Spirit and power of God, to Christ who fulfils the types, figures, shadows, promises, prophecies that were of Him, —and is led by the Holy Ghost into the truth and

[29] 'Homo itaque fide, spe, et caritate subnixus, eaque inconcussè retinens, *non indiget Scripturis* — nisi ad alios instruendos. Quibus tamen, quasi machinis, tanta fidei et caritatis in eis surrexit instructio ut, perfectum aliquid tenentes, ea quæ sunt ex parte non quærant.' (Aug. *de Doctr.* i. 39.)

[30] Ἀπαρχὴ μὲν πασῶν γραφῶν τὰ εὐαγγέλια, τῶν δὲ εὐαγγελίων ἀπαρχὴ τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην. οὗ τὸν νοῦν οὐδεὶς δύναται λαβεῖν μὴ ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος Ἰησοῦ. (Orig. *in Joann.* i. p. 14: Lommatsch.)

substance of the Scriptures, sitting down in Him who is the Author and End of them; *then* they are read and understood, with profit and great delight[31].'

And why (one asks with amazement), cannot the very same principle be applied to all the glorious and beautiful and instructive symbolism, creeds, sacraments, and other mechanism of that Church,—wherein the same Holy Ghost hath promised evermore to dwell? Surely herein He hath not belied His mission, to take of the things of Christ and to show them unto us! And the long and varied developments of the Church (even down to the singular phenomena of the sixteenth century, which no one has yet been able fully to explain), have not surely been a collapse and apostasy and failure, lasting 1500—or even 1800—years! Can it be, that George Fox too was a victim of the old Puritan delusion, that the Scriptures are the *sole* organ of the Holy Ghost in this world[32]? Is Quakerism too bound up to the belief, that the Church was left by her Divine and All-wise Founder, so scantily furnished, so ill-found in all the means and helps of grace,—that a *Book* was all He gave her? That her noble and intelligent efforts to provide herself with a framework, to clothe her body 'all glorious within' with a raiment of fair needle-work, honourable to her spouse, and comely for her children to see,—was a gross apostasy? That her common-sense procedure (which those who study history can fully understand), in organizing herself for a large and long

[31] *Journal*, i. 69.

[32] The Quakers unhesitatingly accept and employ the Holy Scriptures, though they will accept no other of the *media* of grace, which Christ has committed to the Church's hands. 'That "light" could not be the Scriptures of the New Testament; for it was testified of before any part of the New Testament was written.' (*Journal*, ii. 22.) 'Yet I had no slight esteem of the Holy Scriptures, but they were very precious to me; for I was in that Spirit by which they were given forth, and what the Lord opened to me, I afterwards found was agreeable to them.' (*Ibid.* i. 71.)

campaign, was treason and folly? And her beautiful shell-work of external symbolism, of architecture, music, ritual and sacraments,—so purely natural, spontaneous and expressive,—were all the work of the devil and not of the 'indwelling light;' an accursed and detestable thing,—because (forsooth) it was Christian and not Gnostic, Catholic and adapted to all ages and not merely to the age of prose, and (like man himself, for whom it was all meant, and even the Lord Himself, who 'despised not the Virgin's womb,') was compounded of body as well as soul, and did not take for granted that the deepest depths of all religious philosophy had been reached, when the word 'spirituality' had been uttered?

Yet it seems that this *must* be the Quakers' very great mistake. For when you go into one of their meeting-houses, if you reflect on what you see and can get over the first strangeness of it, you find yourself present at one of the most extraordinary external presentations of the notion of non-externalism that the human mind has perhaps ever conceived. Everything around you is a symbol of anti-symbolism. All the Church's well-used 'media,' or means of grace, are absent. Every trace of her chequered history, and of the thousand suggestions of varied times and men and countries which her ritual presents, is wiped out as with a sponge. One memory alone survives,—and it is one which every thoughtful man would fain be rid of,—viz. the memory of the almost frenzied and despairing effort of the distracted seventeenth century, to be rid (at one blow) of all the banners and watchwords of the chaotic sects, and (if it must be so) to begin Christianity absolutely afresh and over again.

Impossible wish! Though it is the persistent effort of every Dissenting community; some fixing one period,

some another, to which the hour-hand of history shall be pushed back[33]: and none having faith to see, that the nineteenth century cannot be either the sixteenth century, or the middle ages, or the fourth or fifth centuries of dogmatic development; or the Primitive Church; or the Apostolic Age; or indeed anything but itself: none having simplicity and filial confidence enough to walk with God in His Church as it has now grown to be; and with patience and modesty to help and guide, —not destroy and render impracticable,—its healthy growth for the future.

Quakerism however, so far as lay in its power, and so far as the external developments of the Church are concerned, has committed this great sin and error against our Common Master. You sit down in their assembly —'gathered' remember, at enormous cost and suffering, out of all the ecclesiastical bodies in the seventeenth century—and in the plain square chamber, filled with perhaps a numerous assembly, a thrilling and profoundly solemn silence reigns. No one opens a book, no aid to meditation of any sort or kind is vouchsafed. It is an act of patient waiting upon God; a listening for any faint and still small whispers of the inward voice—presumed and hoped to be the inspiration of the Holy Ghost—which shall at last unseal some lips, and issue in vocal prayer, instruction, or exhortation. And mean-

[33] 'I know not any one gap that hath let in more and more dangerous errors into the Church than this,—that men take the words of the sacred text, fitted to particular occasions, and to the condition of the times wherein they were written, and then apply them to themselves .. Sundry things spoken in Scripture agreeably to that infancy of the Church, would sort very ill with the Church in her fulness of strength .. Thus the constitutions that the Apostles made concerning deacons and widows in those primitive times, are with much importunity, but very importunely withal, urged by the "discipline"-arians.' (Bishop Sanderson (A. D. 1634), *Sermons*, i. 216.)

while, such morbid dread exists in some persons present, of the slightest external symbolism, that the very attitudes remain unchanged. The hat is not removed from the head, the knee remains unbent, no sign of attention, of interest or of concurrence in what is said, manifests itself. The outward is (as far as it can be) utterly abolished; the man, as God made him, is not allowed to exist; his body is forgotten, his spirit is alone recognized as having any wants, any rights, (I had almost said) any *redemption*, within the house of God.

And not only so: but along with all the other and lesser 'sacramenta,' or outward media of inward grace, even the two great Sacraments (instituted by the Lord Himself) have also been allowed to disappear. 'The baptism of the Holy Ghost and the Communion of the body and blood of Christ (says one of their writers) are not dependent on these outward ceremonies[34].' The spiritual man, therefore, cannot need them. If we have 'Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith' (say they), what can we possibly want with external receptions of Him? His dying commands, His parting injunctions, we do not contemn; but only interpret them in our own way. We *spiritually* communicate. We do not believe that manducation is the only way to feed on Christ, or water-baptism the only way of admission to His love.

'But oh, dear friends,'—the Churchman may reply,—'did it need you George Fox, and a grievous separation in Christ's family of peace and love, and martyrdoms and sufferings innumerable, to get you to that height of wisdom? Had the founders of your Communion been men of greater modesty or learning, they need not have searched far before they found that (however

[34] Evans' *Exposition of the Faith*, &c. (1867), p. 53.

obscured at that time) the grand teaching of the Catholic Church upon the Sacraments was at least as spiritual, and far more compassionate to weaker souls, than yours. Never, in compassion to such souls, has she said 'Stand by, *till* thou art spiritual; and *then* thou shalt taste that the Lord is precious.' But this she does say and has always said: that when occasion demands it, a man may 'eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour . . . though he do *not* receive the Sacrament with his mouth[35];' she does cry, when the need arises, with St. Augustine, 'Crede! et manducasti[36];'—she does allow, with Tertullian[37], 'that martyrdom for Christ is as good and valid as baptism;'—with Cyprian[38], 'that mere water cannot save a man, unless he have the Spirit too;'—and even, with Justin Martyr[39], 'that many a good heathen (like Socrates) is saved by the Redeemer, and is virtually a Christian, though he has never heard of Christ at all with the outward hearing of the ear.'

In these, then, and several other matters (into which

---

[35] *Prayer-book*, rubric at end of 'Communion of the Sick.' So too, with no less clearness, the mediæval Prayer-book of the Church of England (*Manuale Sarisb.* p. 77, ed. 1555): 'Deinde communicetur infirmus,—nisi de vomitu vel aliâ irreverentiâ probabilitèr timeatur: in quo casu, dicat sacerdos infirmo, "Frater, in hoc casu sufficit tibi vera fides et bona voluntas. Tantùm crede, et manducasti."' Again, Aquinas (A.D. 1250), *Summa*, iii. 80, goes into the whole question, and concludes: 'Duo sunt manducandi modi,—alter sacramentalis, . . alter spiritalis, per quem suscipitur effectus Sacramenti, quo homo spiritaliter Christo conjungitur.' And so Augustine (A.D. 400), *in Joannem*, tract. xxvi. 6. 11: 'Aliud est Sacramentum, aliud virtus Sacramenti. Quàm multi de altari accipiunt, et moriuntur! . . . Hunc itaque "cibum et potum" societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum,—quod est sancta Ecclesia . . Hujus rei Sacramentum . . de mensâ dominicâ sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: Res verò ipsa, cujus Sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam . . Hoc est ergò "manducare" illam escam, et illum "bibere" potum,—in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere.' I venture to assert, that no more spiritual doctrine than this can be found in all Quaker literature.

[36] Aug. *in Joannem*, xxv. 6. 12.

[37] Tert. *de Bapt.* § 16.

[38] Cypr. *Ep.* 74.

[39] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 46.

the time forbids me now to enter) it surely appears that the Church's doctrine is complete and solid; while that of the Quakers is merely superficial and one-sided. Their teaching indeed is true *as far as it goes*, and so long as it consists of *affirmations*. The Church also (as we have seen) affirms these things,—and with far more real power and good sense. But their teaching goes a very sorry distance indeed; makes some disastrous miscalculations as to what human nature and human society, on the large scale, are like; lays its people open to some gross delusions, from forgetting that *impulses* (even from above) are not always to be given way to; for that such an abdication of calm health and self-control is nothing else than 'to be carried away' (as St. Paul says, ἀπάγεσθαι) like a heathen [40]. Quakerism fails to observe that the Apostle, in passages like those which I have quoted for the text, distinctly places the outward unity, peace, and order of the Church first, and the dictates of the prophetical spirit second. Above all, it has brought itself (in its fancied wisdom, but real self-will) to disobey the plain commands of Christ about the use of

[40] Nothing is more remarkable than the thorough soundness and *healthfulness* of the teaching, both of the Holy Scripture and of the Catholic Church,—in contradistinction to the morbid and fanatical tendencies of all sectarian theology. Observe e.g. the calm wisdom of 1 Cor. xii-xiv. ('Ye *were* heathens, carried away just as the impulse seized you. . . But the Spirit is given to *profit* withal. . . So, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the *edifying* of the Church . . . Be not children . . If there be no interpreter, let him [a possessor of the gift of tongues] keep silence in the Church . . If anything be revealed to another sitting by, let the first hold his peace . . *The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.* God is not the author of confusion.') And contrast this with the following passage from George Fox's *Journal* (ii. 56): 'As I was in bed at Bristol, the word of the Lord came to me, that I must go back to London. Next morning, Alexander Parker and several others came to me: I asked them, "What they felt?" They in like manner asked me "What was upon me?" . . so we gave up, to return to London. For whatever way the Lord moved and led us, thither we went in His power.' (Cf. i. 100: Neal, iii. 442, &c.)

outward means of grace, to contemn the usages and sentiments of the whole Church for fifty generations, and (by a strange relapse to the very Puritanism against which its earliest protest was raised[41]) to shrivel the Church once more into a select club, where all is calculated,—not for the weak, the low, the babes and beginners in Christ,—but for the τέλειοι, the spiritual, the men (far fewer probably than they themselves imagine) who can do without the aids and props of external sacred things.

We Churchmen therefore will candidly and gratefully acknowledge all that is good and pure and elevating in Quaker doctrine; and will (I hope) not be ashamed to own that the early Friends were 'friends' indeed (although in strangely repulsive guise and with strangely uncourteous behaviour[42]); and will confess that of the persecutions which they underwent from Dissenters and Churchmen alike in earlier times, we (to speak for ourselves) are heartily sorry and repentant.

For their protest against Puritanism and Calvinism was just that which the Church herself ought to have made: their large-hearted doctrine of the 'inner light' was almost Catholicity itself: their teaching about the Holy Ghost was also the teaching of the Nicene Creed: and even their ritual peculiarities have found no small

[41] Fox 'exasperated them by his plain dealing, in endeavouring to show them that though they—being Presbyterians and Independents—were high in the profession of religion, they were without the possession of that they professed.' (*Neal*, iii. 420.)

[42] Cf. Vaughan, *English Nonconformity*, p. 144: 'Filled with the mystical notion that their impulses were not so much human, as divine, there seemed to be no end to their eccentricities, their invasions of the rights of their neighbours, or even to their indecencies. Every ministry beyond that of their own sect was the ministry of "Baal" and of "Antichrist." They assailed ministers as such in the public streets, even such men as Baxter, flinging the most offensive language at them as a testimony from heaven.' In these respects, however, they were unawares imitating the older Puritans and Independents.

sympathy among the deepest thinkers of the Church, in every age[43].

But then, in justice and charity to them and in fidelity to our own people, we will not cease to protest against an excessive *spirituality* which forgets the body, and dissipates thereby the force and efficiency of Christ's kingdom. For, that steam alone will propel our goods and persons, without an elaborate machinery to compress and direct it, we cannot readily bring ourselves to believe; nor yet, that intelligence can best work without a brain; an army without officers or drill; a state without organization; or that the mighty subtle life that stirs within us, and subdues and changes all things at our will, can remain a present and effective power in the world, if we kill and destroy that framework of nerves and muscles, by which it mysteriously acts.

By the grace of God, therefore, we will loyally maintain and guard that ancient organization of the Church which,—corresponding more nearly than any other now existing system, to that which meets us in the Acts of the Apostles, and dating back (on the earliest testi-

[43] E.g. Hermas [A.D. 150], *Pastor*, ii. 11: 'Spiritus qui desursùm est, *quietus* est et humilis . . Neque quùm vult, homini loquitur Spiritus Dei; sed tunc loquitur, *quùm vult Deus* . . et loquitur in turbâ, sicut vult Deus.' —Coptic Apost. Const. ap. Bunsen, *Anal.* iii. 399 [A.D. 300]: 'At midnight all Creation is *silent*, praising Thee.'—S. Greg. Nyssen [A.D. 380], *in Psalm.* cap. x: τὸ διάψαλμα, διδασκαλία παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τῇ ψυχῇ. —S. Augustine [A.D. 400], *Confess.* x. 33: 'Valdè interdum, ut melos omne cantilenarum suavium, quibus Davidicum Psalterium frequentatur, ab auribus meis *removeri* velim, atque ipsius Ecclesiæ.'—S. Bernard [A.D. 1150], *Op.* i. 110: 'Ligna et lapides docebunt te, quod à magistris *audire* non possis.'—Hooker [A.D. 1600], *Eccl. Pol.* i. 2. 2: 'Our safest eloquence concerning Him is our *silence*.' —Spenser, *Hymn of heavenly Beauty*, Park. Soc. i. 18:

'Cease then, my *tongue!* And lend unto my mynd
Leave to bethink how great that Beautie is,
Whose utmost parts so beautifull I fynd:
How much more those essentiall parts of His!'

mony) from St. John and his school in Asia Minor,—has proved itself by 1800 years' experience the best adapted to the wants of mankind, the most efficient by far for all the beneficent purposes which the Church was intended to fulfil, the most supple in stooping to men of low estate, the most noble in facing—with the 'cor sacerdotale[44]'—the iniquities and follies of the world's highest ranks, the most natural and normal organ for enshrining and giving the freest practical scope to that, which at every matins and evensong she prays that both her Clergy and her people may abundantly possess—'the healthful spirit of God's grace.'

[44] Greg. the Great, *de Past. Curâ*, ii. 3, thus beautifully plays upon Exod. xxviii. 8: 'Auro quoque et hyacintho purpura permiscetur: ut videlicet Sacerdotale cor, cùm summa quæ prædicat sperat, in semetipso etiam suggestiones vitiorum reprimat, eisque (velut ex regiâ potestate) contradicat . . De hâc quippe *nobilitate* spiritûs per Petrum dicitur: "Vos autem genus electum, regale sacerdotium."'

# APPENDIX H.

## *'The chief principles of the Christian religion, as professed by the people called Quakers.'*

[These fifteen Propositions—of which the most important points are here given—were drawn up by Robert Barclay, first in Latin, and afterwards in English, A.D. 1678. They form the headings of the fifteen chapters of his celebrated *Apology for the Quakers.* The following extracts are transcribed from the latest edition of the *Apology* (thirteenth edit. 1869). The Propositions are also to be found—under the title given above—in Toulmin's edition of Neal, iii. 569.]

### I. *Concerning the true foundation of Knowledge.*

'Seeing the height of all happiness is placed in the true knowledge of God . . the right understanding of this foundation and ground of knowledge is that which is most necessary to be known and believed in the first place.'

### II. *Concerning immediate Revelation.*

'Seeing no man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth Him; and seeing the revelation of the Son is in and by the Spirit; therefore the testimony of the Spirit is that alone by which the true knowledge of God hath been, is and can be only revealed; . . by the revelation of the same Spirit He hath manifested Himself all along unto the sons of men, both patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; which revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward voices and appearances, dreams, or inward objective manifestations in the heart, were of old the formal object of their faith, and remain yet so to be; since the object of the saints' faith is the same in all ages, though set forth under divers administrations. Moreover, these divine inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith, neither do nor can contradict the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or right and sound reason. Yet from hence it will not follow, that these divine revelations are to be subjected to the examination either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule and

touchstone; for this divine revelation, and inward illumination, is that which is evident and clear of itself, forcing, by its own evidence and clearness, the well-disposed understanding to assent, irresistibly moving the same thereunto.' . . .

III. *Concerning the Scriptures.*

'From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints, have proceeded the Scriptures of truth, . . nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners. Nevertheless, as that which giveth a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are and may be esteemed a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit from which they have all their excellency and certainty.' . . .

IV. *Concerning the Condition of Man in the Fall.*

'All Adam's posterity (or mankind) both Jews and Gentiles, as to the first Adam or earthly man, is fallen, degenerated, and dead, deprived of the sensation or feeling of this inward testimony or seed of God; and is subject unto the power, nature, and seed of the serpent. . . Hence are rejected, the Socinian and Pelagian errors, in exalting a natural light; as also those of the Papists, and most Protestants, who affirm that man, without the true grace of God, may be a true minister of the Gospel. Nevertheless, this seed is not imputed to infants, until by transgression they actually join themselves therewith: for "they are by nature the children of wrath, who walk according to the power of the prince of the air."' . . .

V. and VI. *Concerning the Universal Redemption by Christ, and also the Saving and Spiritual Light wherewith every man is enlightened.*

'God out of His infinite love, who delighteth not in the death of a sinner, but that all should live and be saved, hath so loved the world, that He hath given His only Son a light, that whosoever believeth in Him should be saved; who enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. . .

. . 'Therefore Christ hath tasted death for every man; not only for all kinds of men, as some vainly talk, but for every one, of all kinds; the benefit of whose offering is not only extended to such who have the distinct outward knowledge of His death and sufferings, as the same is declared in the Scriptures, but even unto those who are necessarily excluded from

the benefit of this knowledge by some inevitable accident; which knowledge we willingly confess to be very profitable and comfortable, but not absolutely needful unto such, from whom God Himself had withheld it.' . .

VII. *Concerning Justification.*

'As many as resist not this light, but receive the same, in them is produced a holy, pure, and spiritual birth; bringing forth holiness, righteousness, purity, and all those other blessed fruits which are acceptable to God. By which holy birth (to wit, Jesus Christ formed within us, and working His works within us), as we are sanctified, so are we justified in the sight of God.' . .

VIII. *Concerning Perfection.*

'In whom this holy and pure birth is fully brought forth, the body of death and sin comes to be crucified and removed, and their hearts united and subjected to the truth, so as not to obey any suggestion or temptation of the evil one, but to be free from actually sinning, and transgressing of the law of God, and in that respect perfect. Yet doth this perfection still admit of a growth; and there remaineth a possibility of sinning, where the mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord.'

IX. *Concerning Perseverance, and the Possibility of falling from Grace.*

'. . in whom it hath wrought in part, to purify and sanctify them . . such may fall from it, and turn it to wantonness, making shipwreck of faith; and after having tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, again fall away. Yet such an increase and stability in the truth may in this life be attained, from which there cannot be a total apostasy.'

X. *Concerning the Ministry.*

'As by this gift, or light of God, all true knowledge in things spiritual is received and revealed; . . by the leading, moving, and drawing hereof, ought every Evangelist and Christian pastor to be led and ordered in his labour and work of the Gospel, both as to the place where, as to the persons to whom, and as to the times when he is to minister. Moreover, those who have this authority may and ought to preach the Gospel, though without human commission or literature, as, on the other hand, those who want the authority of this divine gift, however learned or authorized by the commissions of men and churches, are to be esteemed but as deceivers, and not true ministers of the Gospel. Also, those who have received this holy and unspotted gift, as they have freely received, so are they freely to give, without hire or bargaining, far less to use it as a trade to get money by it.' . .

### XI. *Concerning Worship.*

'All true and acceptable worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving and drawing of His own Spirit, which is neither limited to places, times, or persons: for though we be to worship Him always, in that we are to fear before Him; yet as to the outward signification thereof in prayers, praises and preaching, we ought not to do it where and when we will, but where and when we are moved thereunto by the secret inspiration of His Spirit in our hearts; . . All other worship then, both praises, prayers and preachings, which man sets about in his own will, and at his own appointment, which he can both begin and end at his pleasure, do or leave undone as himself sees meet; whether they be a prescribed form, as a liturgy, or prayers conceived extemporarily, by the natural strength and faculty of the mind; they are all but superstitions, will-worship, and abominable idolatry, in the sight of God; which are to be denied, rejected, and separated from in this day of His spiritual arising.'

### XII. *Concerning Baptism.*

'As there is one Lord and one faith, so there is one baptism; which is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience before God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the baptism of the Spirit and fire, by which we are buried with Him, that being washed and purged from our sins, we may walk in newness of life; of which the baptism of John was a figure which was commanded for a time, and not to continue for ever. As to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scripture.'

### XIII. *Concerning the Communion, or Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.*

'The Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is inward and spiritual, which is the participation of His flesh and blood, by which the inward man is daily nourished in the hearts of those in whom Christ dwells; of which things the breaking of bread by Christ with His disciples was a figure, which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the substance, for the cause of the weak; even as abstaining from things strangled, and from blood, the washing one another's feet and the anointing of the sick with oil; all which are commanded with no less authority and solemnity than the former; yet seeing they are but the shadows of better things, they cease in such as have obtained the substance.'

XIV. *Concerning the power of the Civil Magistrate, in matters purely religious, and pertaining to the Conscience.*

'Since God hath assumed to Himself the power and dominion of the conscience, who alone can rightly instruct and govern it, therefore it is not lawful for any whatsoever, by virtue of any authority or principality they bear in the government of this world, to force the consciences of others; . . provided always, that no man, under the pretence of conscience, prejudice his neighbour in his life or estate; or do anything destructive to, or inconsistent with, human society; in which case the law is for the transgressor, and justice to be administered upon all, without respect of persons.'

XV. *Concerning Salutations and Recreations, &c.*

'Seeing the chief end of all religion is to redeem man from the spirit and vain conversation of this world, and to lead into inward communion with God, before whom if we fear always, we are accounted happy; therefore all the vain customs and habits thereof, both in word and deed, are to be rejected and forsaken by those who come to this fear; such as the taking off the hat to a man, the bowing and cringings of the body, and such other salutations of that kind, with all the foolish and superstitious formalities attending them.' . .

# LECTURE VI.

## THE UNITARIANS.

A.D. 1719.

*Leading Idea* :—The Intellectual Freedom of the Church.

*Method adopted* :—Abolition of all engagements, which may fetter the free teaching of the Clergy.

Ζητήσατε οὖν Αὐτὸν, καὶ κραταιώθητε! ζητήσατε τὸ πρόσωπον Αὐτοῦ, διὰ παντὸς, παντοίως! πολυμερῶς γὰρ καὶ πολυτρόπως λαλήσας. οὐχ ἁπλῶς γνωρίζεται. (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 10. 81.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

*c.* 100. The Ebionites,—an ultra-Judaizing sect.
*c.* 200. Theodotus, at Byzantium: Artemon, at Rome.
270. Paul, Bishop of Samosata, condemned.
325. Arius, presbyter of Alexandria, condemned.
351. Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, deposed.
381. Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople, condemned.
*c.* 400. Arianism takes refuge with the Goths.
— Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia.
431. Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, deposed.
*c.* 800. Adoptionist controversies, in France and Spain.
*c.* 1100. Abelard (rationalist): Roscelin (nominalist).
1300. Duns Scotus: William Occam.
1450. Nicolas of Cusa, 'De doctâ ignorantiâ.'
1500. John Denck, professor at Basle.
1552. Servetus burnt by Calvin.
1562. Lælius Socinus died.
1604. Faustus Socinus died.
1647. John Biddle imprisoned for heresy.
1689. 'Toleration Act,'—Unitarians excluded.

---

1719. 'Salters' Hall controversy.'
— Unitarians a distinct Denomination.
1729. Dr. Samuel Clarke died.
*c.* 1750. 'General Baptists' adopt Unitarian doctrines.
— English 'Presbyterians' adopt Unitarian doctrines.
1771. 'Feathers Tavern Petition,' against subscription.
1794. Priestley sails for America.
1811. Belsham's 'Calm Inquiry.'
1813. Laws against Unitarians repealed.
1827. Hicksite Quakers adopt Unitarian doctrines.
1842. Channing died.
1844. 'Dissenters' Chapels Act.'
1860. Theodore Parker died.
1869. J. J. Tayler died.

# LECTURE VI.

## THE UNITARIANS.

'If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.'—1 *Cor.* iii. 18.

WE have now passed under review and given some amount of careful and, I hope, not uncandid or unfriendly study to two successive pairs of Dissenting bodies; viz. those which broke off from the Church of England in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. And we have not failed to remark that the controversies which mainly characterized those two centuries were of a dissimilar type. The cause of divergence in the sixteenth century being the merely exterior question of *Church-polity*,—on which the Independents seceded, and drifted away in the direction of excessive liberty and of ultimate anarchy; while the Romanists broke off in the direction of excessive centralization, and have since drifted towards, and reached, an ecclesiastical despotism.—In the seventeenth century, we have seen that the matters in dispute were of a more interior nature. The use or disuse of the Church's 'sacramenta,' or external *means of grace*, was the question mainly at issue. And here the Baptists represented one tendency of

thought, and the Quakers the diametrically opposite one.—We now approach the controversies of the eighteenth century, and the two principal secessions in which those controversies terminated; viz. UNITARIANISM on the one hand, and WESLEYANISM on the other[1].

The questions, on which those two controversies hinged, are of extreme interest and of paramount importance. But they are of a still more subtle nature, and belong (so to speak) to a still more interior department of the Church's life, than either of the questions which agitated the preceding centuries. They are, in a word, questions relating to the Church's *system of doctrine*, to her educational method of procedure, to her tactics, and to the way in which she should give battle to the frowning forces of ignorance and sin, which are still in possession of half the world. And here Unitarianism—interested mainly with the more thoughtful and educated classes—went off in the pursuit of an unlimited intellectual freedom; while Wesleyanism—interested rather in the lowest strata of society, the neglected, untaught crowds, whom commercial prosperity was at once engendering and disowning—seceded in search of more potent and immediately efficient methods of onset; handled, with an almost sublime self-confidence, the tremendous spell of an appeal to the mere *feelings* of half-taught and half-civilized men; and buoyed itself unhesitatingly on the crest of a wave, whose swiftness and power might at any moment resolve themselves into a destructive fanaticism.

[1] 'It was a one-sided subjective tendency, which made its appearance in Socinianism. Here, it took the path of the *understanding*,—and led to Rationalism. But it could also take that of the *feelings*,—and then it assumed the form of Mysticism.' (Neander, *Hist. of Dogmas*, ii. 630.)

Such questions as these were, unmistakeably, questions which belonged to the eighteenth century. They naturally sprang up, at a period when the world was utterly weary of Puritanism and all its childish contentions; when the Church and all the Dissenting bodies alike slumbered and slept; and when the turning-point, the *aphelion*, of Christendom had at last been reached and the 'revival of religion' was happily about to begin.

Hence the eighteenth century is at once a most painful and dreary, and also a most profoundly interesting and momentous period of the Church's history. There is no one, probably, now living who does not congratulate himself that his lot was not cast in that epoch. It has become, by general consent, an object for ridicule and sarcasm[2]. Its very dress and airs had something about them which irresistibly moves a smile. Its literature—with some noble exceptions—stands neglected upon our shelves. Its poetry has lost all power to enkindle us. Its science is exploded: its taste condemned: its ecclesiastical arrangements flung to the winds: its religious ideas outgrown, and in rapid process of a complete and perhaps hardly deserved extinction.

What can be the cause of so remarkable and sudden a revulsion of feeling? How can we account for this chasm, which seems to have opened and spread so quickly, between the men of the eighteenth and the men of the nineteenth century?

The cause is to be sought for in the fact, that *in the*

[2] For descriptions of eighteenth century life, see the *Spectator*, *Tatler*, &c.; Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, Fielding's *Novels*, Miss Seward's *Letters;* and—among modern books—Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*. But perhaps the most vivid conception of all may be obtained by studying Hogarth's pictorial satires of his own age.

*eighteenth century an old world was passing away.* For 300 years—such is the grand scale on which history measures her epochs—the Middle Ages had lain in the long throes and agonies of death. And in the eighteenth century they died. Before that century was ended, the great transition was accomplished. In politics, a new theory had been adopted by England, by America, and then by France. In philosophy, a new system had sprung up, and was beginning its successful career, at Königsberg, on the eastern frontiers of Germany[3]. And in taste,—from whence, it is impossible to say; except it be from those hidden, mysterious storehouses of our common humanity, from which so many half-obliterated memories and forgotten habits are being constantly revived,—a new and romantic love of nature suddenly manifested itself. So that Rousseau and others went into ecstasies of delight at things and scenes, which Dr. Johnson—a man of the older culture—had deliberately ranked below Cheapside[4]. And phi-

[3] Immanuel Kant was born at Königsberg in 1724. He resided there during the whole of a long life, and died there in 1804. His two most important works are, the *Critik of pure Reason* (1781), and the *Critik of practical Reason* (1788). See K. Fischer, *Kant's Leben*, &c., 1860.

[4] '"Yesterday I returned from my Welsh journey .. I have been in five of the six counties of North Wales; have been upon Penmaenmawr and Snowdon, and passed over into Anglesea. But Wales is so little different from England, that it offers nothing to the speculation of the traveller." All I heard him say of it was, that "instead of bleak and barren mountains, there were green and fertile ones."' (Boswell, ii. 183.) 'We walked in the evening in Greenwich Park. He asked me, "Is not this very fine!" .. I answered, "Yes, Sir; but not equal to Fleet Street." Johnson: "You are right, Sir". . Let me shelter myself under the authority of a very fashionable baronet, who, on his attention being called to the fragrance of a May evening in the country, observed . . "for my part, I prefer the smell of a flambeau at the playhouse."' (*Ibid.* i. 266.) Contrast the following: 'Je me sou viens d'avoir passé une nuit délicieuse hors de la ville [Lyons]: . . la soirée était charmante; la rosée humectait l'herbe flétrie; le soleil, après son coucher, avait laissé dans le ciel des vapeurs rouges; . . Je me promenais dans une sorte d'extase.' (Rousseau, *Confessions*, i. 4, p. 157.) 'On sait ce que j'entends par un beau pays . . Il me faut des torrents, des rochers, des sapins, des bois noirs, des mon-

losophers, poets, and divines rivalled each other in extravagant encomiums on savage life,—which had (not unreasonably) struck the Pilgrim Fathers, a century earlier, with repugnance and terror[5].

We must then never forget, in studying the religious phenomena of the eighteenth century, what an extraordinary period of transition it was. On a small scale it represented the first few centuries of the Christian era. It repeated their effeteness. It reproduced a similar dying and corrupt condition of society. And in its utter unnaturalness, coldness, and unbelief, it felt the same urgent need of regeneration by an upspring from below, and from the heart of the people, of a new warmth and life; which should clothe the dead tree with beauty once more, and bring forth, in due time, bright leaves and wholesome fruit.

Amid this wintry day it was,—while the Church, as well as most other European institutions, slumbered and slept,—that two provisional forms of religious life made their appearance, as heralds of the returning spring. The first of these, with which we are to employ ourselves to-day, being unmistakeably of an eighteenth-century cast: viz. *Unitarianism.*

The history of Unitarianism in England is not very important. Of course, all Denominations display a

---

tagnes, des précipices à mes côtés qui me fassent bien peur.' (*Ibid.* p. 161.) The man of the nineteenth century, the reader of Wordsworth, Tennyson, Ruskin, Emerson, feels that here his own age has already dawned.

[5] 'The Indians, whose cry was "dreadful" . . "these poor blind savages."' (Morton's *New England's Memorial*, 1669: ap. Hanbury, i. 399.) Wesley (1735) 'looked forward to the conversion of the Indians as comparatively an easy task: there, he said, he should have the advantage of preaching to a people not yet beguiled by philosophy and vain deceit.' (Southey's *Wesley*, p. 47.)

'Nor think in Nature's state they blindly trod;
The state of Nature was the reign of God.'
(Pope, *Essay on Man*, iii. 4.)

pardonable pride in tracing themselves back, through I know not what devious channels, to the first founders of Christianity. All find their ancestors in the Primitive Church, and all see their patent of nobility in the Acts of the Apostles.

The ingenuity herein displayed is often extremely praiseworthy; the compliment paid to the Church's view of these matters, if unintentional, is still welcome; and the warning conveyed against the extreme simplicity of attempting to settle such controversies as these by an appeal to Scripture texts, is salutary and decisive. The Unitarians accordingly claim kindred, first of all, with the Judaizers and Ebionites of the first century; then with Artemon[6] and Paul of Samosata[7]; with Photinus, Arius[8], Abelard, the Albigenses and the Anabaptists; and so on to Socinus and the Italian reaction against the virtual paganism of the Papal Court, under Leo X., in the sixteenth century.

And no doubt, this claim to an early origin on the part of all the post-Reformation sects is (in a certain sense) a true one. For they all appealed to the Bible, and sought their models in its pages. And just as a sort of Congregationalism may really be found in the New Testament as an embryo arrangement befitting an embryo condition; just as adult baptism may be found in the 'Acts' of a Church planting itself amid a crowd of Jews and heathens,—precisely as it may be found used freely by the Church at the present day in India or in Bethnal

[6] The opinions of Artemon (*c.* A.D. 200) are thus described by Theodoret (*Hær. Fab.* ii. 4): Τὸν δὲ Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶπε ψιλὸν, ἐκ παρθένου γεγεννήμενον, τῶν δὲ προφητῶν ἀρετῇ κρείττονα. Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἔλεγε κεκηρύχεναι . . τοὺς δὲ μετ' ἐκείνους θεολογῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν, οὐκ ὄντα θεόν.

[7] Biddle, *Brief History of the Unitarians* (second edit., 1691), p. 10.

[8] Dr. Beard, *Cycl. Rel. Denom.*, p. 310.

Green or Wolverhampton; so, possibly, Unitarian theology might be found amid the half-formed and tentative theories of a Christian society that had lately lost its Master, and had not yet (under stress of 'winds of false doctrine' blowing from every quarter under heaven) rooted itself firmly in the soil, or grown to full conviction as to WHO precisely that marvellous Being was, that, after a ministry of three short years, had left mankind absolutely metamorphosed and had 'turned the world upside down[9].'

But it does not therefore follow, that either the Congregationalist polity, the Baptist ritual, or the Unitarian theology are fitted for the present adult condition of the Church, after 1800 years of study and experience. Unless indeed the extraordinary hypothesis be true, (about which we have already had occasion to speak so often in these Lectures); viz. that the embryo condition of the Church was meant to be its *normal* condition; that all *growth* and adaptation were vetoed from the very beginning[10]; and that the New Testament

[9] It is however remarkable, and a proof of the profound impression which our Lord's Person made on His contemporaries, that all the earliest errors which arose about Him erred on the side of wild extravagance. He was one of the 'old prophets risen again;' He was 'an Æon' or emanation from the Divine; His body was an incorporeal body, and He had not really 'come in the flesh:' or more exactly, the man Jesus was a mere man, born of Joseph and Mary; while Christ was an Æon who had descended on Him at His baptism and left Him at His crucifixion. This last was perhaps the notion of the Jewish Ebionites, who *περὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμοίως τῷ Κηρίνθῳ καὶ Καρποκράτει μυθεύουσι.* (*Iren.* i. 22.) *Within* the Church, therefore, it seems to have been reserved for Theodotus and Artemon (about A.D. 200) to broach the opinion that our Lord, in His whole Personality, was *ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος.* Although Artemon pretended that, *ταῦτα καὶ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους κεκηρύχεναι.* (Theodoret, ubi supra.)

[10] It is one among many proofs that (in the words of Mr. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ*, preface), 'The questions, "Is there a Catholic Church? What are its principles and constitution?" [should] take precedence of all others' in our day,—that we find even Mr. Vance Smith demanding, in 1871, 'Where is this, or anything like this, to be found in either *Testament?* When and where, pre-

was to be to Christendom,—what the Koran has been to Mahometan countries, and the Talmud to the Jews, —*a barrier to all free thought* and an impediment to all free movement, throughout the succeeding ages.

Yet it was, in fact, on this strange hypothesis that Unitarianism in the sixteenth century at first took its stand. Servetus the Spaniard, about 1550, called his greatest work (now the rarest of all printed books) a *Restoration of Christianity*. Socinus, the Italian, is described as having been led to his opinions entirely by an examination of Scripture. His nephew's first book, in 1570, was *On the Authority of Holy Scripture*. And John Biddle, the first Unitarian separatist in England, in 1645, not only came to his opinions purely by a solitary study of the Bible, but always loudly appealed (amid his various persecutions) to the much-vaunted principle of Chillingworth,—who himself died a Unitarian,—that 'the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.'

This man, Mr. Biddle, was a M.A. of Magdalen Hall; a good Latin scholar; and of a truly devout, earnest, and pure character. In 1641 he became master of the Grammar School at Gloucester. And there prosecuting his studies, he eventually declared himself by conviction a Unitarian[11]. His confident appeals, however, to the

cisely, in the teaching of *Scripture*, is the new idea of a divine plurality, a divine threeness, first distinctly introduced? . . Can Dr. Liddon, or any other person, confidently *lay his hand upon the place?*' (V. Smith, *The Bible and Popular Theology*, p. 83.)

[11] The strangely prosaic and irritable state of mind which generated modern Unitarianism, and which reduced the subtle questions of theology to questions of a bald arithmetic, appears at once in Mr. Biddle's writings. 'You teach that there are three Persons who are severally and each of them true God, and yet there is but one true God. This is an *error in counting or numbering*, . . and not to discern it, is not to be a man.' (Biddle, *Brief Hist.* p. 9.) Fifty years later, it began to dawn on such men that, at least, there was something more than *that* in the Church's theology. 'If you would

then much-vaunted 'right of private judgment' did not save him from violent and repeated persecutions. In 1647 he was imprisoned, under Charles I., for heresy. And soon after, certain zealous Puritans in the Westminster Assembly even urged that he should be put to death for his opinions. This, however, Cromwell would not allow; but sent him out of the way of his enemies, with a pension of £25 a year for his maintenance. Returning to London at the Restoration, he opened a chapel; and tried to establish a first Unitarian congregation in England. But the attempt totally failed. He died in prison in 1662. And Unitarianism,—detested and proscribed by all parties alike, and denied toleration in express terms by the very 'Act of Toleration' itself (1689)—sank into obscurity for the remainder of the century [12].

But with the opening of the eighteenth century a marked change took place. The Deism, which had begun with Lord Herbert of Cherbury fifty years earlier, was now (through the writings of Toland, Collins, and others) exercising an enormous—though often an unconscious—influence both upon the Church and upon the sects. For even many good and religious people became inclined towards Unitarian opinions, in order to retain their self-respect, as being (what that age called) 'rational' persons, without forfeiting their alle-

be content with a religion, rather than *a philosophical creed*, Christianity would be better preserved. For what is it, but a scholastic philosophical faith, that runs upon metaphysical notions of "essence" and "persons?"' (Emlyn, *Narrative*, Append. p. lix.) St. Paul, however, was not thus afraid of 'philosophy;' but boldly seized it, and raised it to a higher and spiritual power. *Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν, ἐν τοῖς τελείοις· σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.* (1 *Cor.* ii. 6.)

[12] Marsden. *Dict.* p. 833; Cramp, *Baptists*, p. 277; Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 128.

giance to Christ, whom many of them sincerely loved and served.

And accordingly, not many years elapsed ere,—first in the Dissenting communities, and then in the Church,—this serious form of doctrinal error made its appearance. First, in 1702, Thomas Emlyn—a Presbyterian minister in Dublin—avowed Unitarian opinions, and was driven from his pulpit. In 1710, Whiston, a Cambridge professor, was expelled from the University for the same reason. In 1712, Dr. Samuel Clarke, Rector of a London parish, published his celebrated Arian book on the Trinity. In 1719, the whole Dissenting world was thrown into confusion by (what was called) 'the Salters' Hall Controversy[13].' A great meeting, summoned at

[13] The 'Salters' Hall Controversy' forms one of the most instructive pages in the whole history of modern Dissent; and casts a curious gleam of light—if that were needed—on the freedom of the 'Free Churches.' This angry meeting was held on Feb. 19, 1719, and was composed, in nearly equal numbers, of Presbyterians and Independents. On the vote being taken, seventy-three creed-subscribing Presbyterians were in favour of free-thought: while sixty-nine creed-hating Independents were so determined to impose a test of 'orthodoxy,' that they at once seceded, formed a fresh meeting of their own, themselves subscribed to the first of 'the Thirty-nine Articles,' and demanded a similar submission from the ministers at Exeter. Hereupon, Pierce was locked out of his own chapel by the trustees: and appealing in vain that the congregation should be consulted, he eventually led 300 seceders with him to a new chapel; and 'from this time Unitarianism spread with unexampled rapidity.' (Skeats, *Free Churches*, pp. 302-310.)—In the face of this, and many similar scenes, two things become very difficult to understand: (1) How the Independents, whose 'distinctive principle is, that a church is complete in itself, and that all questions of faith are to be settled by its members' (*Cyclop. Rel. Denom.* p. 191), and whose 'only appeal in all questions touching their religious faith is to the sacred Scriptures' (*Congr. Year-Book*, 1871, p. xx), can call the Unitarians 'heterodox' (Vaughan, *Engl. Nonconf.* p. 466); who are organized precisely on the system of Congregational independence (Marsden, *Dict.* p. 840; Mann, *Census Report*, 1851, p. 25), and have always loudly appealed to the Bible as supporting their views? (E. g. Biddle, *Brief Hist.*, in seventeenth century; Emlyn, *Narrative*, in eighteenth century; Carpenter, *Scriptural Grounds*, 1823; and Vance Smith, *Bible*, &c. 1871.) (2) It is, if possible, still more difficult to understand how the leaders of Unitarianism can range their denomination—nay, all but identify it with—Puritanism. (See James Martineau, *Why Dissent?* 1871.)

that place, to put down a Socinianizing minister at Exeter, split into two violently opposed parties. One still maintained the old watchword of freedom from all creeds and subscriptions; and the other insisted that there was no way left of putting down such fatal errors, but by reverting to tests of that kind. At length, in 1778,—after many clergymen (such as Lindsey, Jebb, Wakefield, Disney), and many Dissenters (such as Priestley, Price, Aikin, Rees, and Belsham) had overtly embraced Unitarianism, and almost all the chapels belonging to the General Baptists and to the Presbyterians had been surrendered to Unitarian teaching [14];—the body firmly established itself, as a separate communion, in England. It extorted toleration from the Government in 1813; and now numbers some 70,000 members, gathered in about 250 congregations.

The denomination is organized, for the most part, on the Independent principle;—each congregation claiming the uncontrolled management of its own doctrine and worship. The general aspect, therefore, of a Unitarian chapel is

[14] 'In the generation which had grown up, on the accession of George III., the Dissenters who passed as *Presbyterians* were generally known to have deserted the faith of their forefathers.' (Vaughan, *English Nonconf.* p. 466.) 'In less than half a century, the doctrines of the great founders of Presbyterianism could scarcely be heard from any Presbyterian pulpit in England. The denomination vanished as suddenly as it had risen. . . The Unitarians became, from this period, a distinct and separate denomination in England. Hitherto it had been their practice to worship with other persons.' (Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 311.) 'In the United States of America, . . the Unitarian societies have, to a great extent, been formed out of the old *Congregationalist* churches.' (*Cyclop. Rel. Den.* p. 311.) 'It is probable the *Baptists* had never been entirely free from this taint.' (Skeats, p. 301.) 'A majority of the American *Quakers* are Unitarians.' (Marsden, p. 841.) 'In Europe, Socinianism prevails in the Church founded by Calvin at Geneva.' (*Ibid.*) It was the rude and mechanical Calvinistic conception of the Atonement . . and the opposing of the Divine Persons . . like parties in a law-suit, which by a natural reaction made Unitarians of the Puritan theologians and preachers.' (Döllinger, *Church and Churches*, p. 239.)

that of an ordinary Dissenting place of worship. But the preaching is more ambitious and philosophical; and the worship aims—in the true spirit of the Church—freely to enlist art and science and every good gift in the service and adoration of their Giver. But it seems to yearn and strive ineffectually after a hearty and popular expression of God's praise,—such as can hardly exist in its cold theological atmosphere.

Indeed Unitarianism is, I believe, generally acknowledged now to be a failing system; and its work (as a separate communion) to be well-nigh done in this country[15]. America is the land where its real successes have been gained. There, under the leadership of able men, like Channing, Parker, and Emerson, it already numbers 600,000 adherents[16]. And there half-sympathizing minds (like that of Renan[17] and others) anticipate for it a brilliant future. In England, on the contrary, no one can attend a Unitarian service, without feeling instinctively, that—able, philosophical, and interesting as the preaching not unfrequently is—the scanty attendance of the less educated classes, and the extreme coldness and constraint of the worship, there offered to the Father alone, indicate a very slender hold upon the English mind. Indeed these results of one's own observation are corroborated by the following

[15] 'Trotz des neuen Aufschwunges jedoch, den der Unitarianismus in England und America genommen hat, ist doch seine geschichtliche Mission . . in der Hauptsache als beendigt anzusehen: seitdem die grössern protestantischen Kirchengemeinschaften das rationale Princip, als bleibenden Bestandtheil ihres kirchlichen Lebens, in sich aufgenommen haben.' (*Convers. Lexicon*, s. voce.)

[16] Cf. *Guardian*, Dec. 11, 1867. Dr. Döllinger (*Church and Churches*, 1861, p. 239) reckons the Unitarian and Universalist preachers in the United States at 944. Dr. Beard (*Cyclop.* p. 311) states that, in 1846, there were about 3000 congregations.

[17] Renan, *Études d'Histoire*, p. 400.

candid and touching confession of one, to whom every Churchman must surely yearn to hold out the right hand of fellowship:—'Socinians (says he) seem to me to contrast unfavourably with their opponents; and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy (on the whole) of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations as a learner, in almost every department, are to others than writers of my own creed... In devotional literature and religious thought, I find nothing of ours that does not pale before Augustine, Tauler, Pascal. And in the poetry of the Church, it is the Latin or the German hymns, or the lines of Charles Wesley or of Keble, that fasten on my memory, and make all else seem poor and cold[18].'

Such words as these,—and from a man of such a character,—should cause us all to reflect, and to ask ourselves one or two very important and heart-searching questions. First of all,—*Why* is it that Unitarianism fails? What is its real meaning, and the real burden of its testimony? and wherein is that testimony faulty and inefficient? And then, secondly,—What is the fault or sin on our side; that such men as these,—so near the Church, so almost in heart and spirit hers, nay, almost of that precise character which she delights especially to honour, and which has representatives in abundance upon her catalogue of saints,—should yet be severed by some *crevasse* (as it were) from her; and so be cut off, both from doing her unspeakable service[19],

[18] Martineau (ap. Ritchie, *Religious Life of London*, p. 200).

[19] 'The Anti-trinitarians . . gradually reducing their tone, sought to gain a firm footing on the empirical soil of *Nature* and *History*. . . They point to a distant future,—to those natural premises [ethical, &c.] without which free Christological progress would be an impossibility.' (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, iv. 142: English trans.)

and also from gaining unspeakable advantages from her?

In attempting to answer these questions, I begin by pointing out—what many thoughtful Unitarians themselves allege—that this name 'Unitarian' is entirely misleading. For it is not in behalf of any one special doctrine, or in protest against any one special error, that their voice has been raised. It is rather in behalf of something far wider, greater, and of more practical importance,—viz. *in defence of intellectual freedom within Christ's Church*[20]. Unitarianism was, in this point of view, a reaction and a protest against the narrow Puritanism of the seventeenth century[21], which claimed to be rational, and was not. And it was a reaction distinctly in the direction of the Church. For it was all very well, at the Reformation, to overthrow the authority

[20] . . 'Least of all should this appear so to *us*, who profess ourselves "Christians and only Christians," pledged to nothing but to lie open to all God's truth.' (Martineau, *Studies of Christianity*, p. 411.) Unitarians, 'strictly speaking, have no corporate capacity; but exist as individuals and in churches, with such partial combination as . . the maintenance of religious liberty may seem to require.' (Dr. Beard, ap. *Cycl. Rel. Denom.* p. 301.)

[21] When it is remembered that, in the *sixteenth century*, Puritanism burnt Servetus at a slow fire and hunted the Unitarians out of every country in Europe; that, in the *seventeenth century*, it desired to put Mr. Biddle to death, and persecuted and anathematized Unitarianism both in England and America; that, in the *eighteenth century*, it drove Pierce, Emlyn, and others with the fiercest theological hatred from their own pulpits; that, in the *nineteenth century*, it wrested Lady Hewley's endowments from Unitarianism, and ceases not to this day to brand it as 'heterodoxy' (Vaughan, *Engl. Nonconf.* p. 466, &c.), and to adhere firmly to its *Westminster Confession* [see Appendix A], and its *Declaration of Faith* [Appendix B],—it is absolutely beyond belief, that Mr. Martineau, in his late pamphlet, should *identify himself and his denomination with 'Puritanism,'* as against the Church of England; and yet should, in the same breath, explain his antipathy to her as caused by her 'whole theory of religion, of human ruin by nature and select rescue by faith, . . and a worship which begins with the abjectness of man before the terror of God, and is lifted thence only by a foreign deliverance, and ends with a borrowed righteousness.' (*Why Dissent?* p. 16.)—every one of which 'theories' belong to the very *essence* of Puritanism.

of the Pope and of the hierarchy, and to establish that of the Bible in their place. But a very short experience sufficed to show that, if this were all, it was simply to substitute one authority for another. Mr. John Biddle and Mr. Thomas Emlyn soon found out in practice, that the appeal had merely been transferred,—from an organized teaching body, proceeding by known rules, and *capable* (to say the least) of very great freedom and elasticity indeed [22],—to a chaotic body of self-constituted and half-instructed interpreters of holy Scripture, from whom no mercy or freedom was to be expected, and who would render inevitable the re-opening (on a far narrower and less intelligible issue) that whole warfare between Authority and Reason, which seemed, perhaps, to some sanguine people to have been closed altogether.

But never, probably, so long as man remains upon the earth, will this conflict be really closed. There will always be persons of a passive and imaginative character, who repose their weight on others, who delight in the splendour of external religious observances [23], who can breathe most freely in an atmosphere of the marvellous and the supernatural,—and whose highest types shine out upon us in the sweet and heavenly creations of a Fra Angelico; while their lowest types gaze, with bated breath, in the awe-stricken ascetics of a Zurbaran. Such persons will

---

[22] 'J'avoue, pour ma part, que j'accepterais plus volontiers l'autorité de l'Église, que celle de la Bible. L'Église est plus humaine, plus vivante. Quelqu'immuable que l'on la suppose, elle se plie mieux aux besoins de chaque époque.' (Renan, *Études*, p. 380.)

[23] 'Le docte Chev. Jones a remarqué l'impuissance de la parole evangelique dans l'Inde. . . C'est toujours l'erreur protestante, qui s'obstine à commençer par la science; tandis qu'il faut commençer par la prédication impérative, accompagnée de la musique, de la peinture, des rites solemnels, et de toutes les démonstrations de la foi, sans discussion. Mais faites comprendre cela à l'orgueil!' (De Maistre, *du Pape*, iii, 1, 241.)

never cease out of the land, or out of the Church. And God forbid that they ever should[24]! For they are, in many ways, the salt of the earth. Nor yet (on the other hand) will the dreaded pretensions of an irrepressible Reason ever, so long as man exists in his present form, be extinguished, or the terrible solvent of its analysis ever be forgotten or laid aside. And again, I say, God forbid that it ever should[25]!

And yet these words, 'dreaded' and 'terrible,' are not one whit too strong. This solvent chemistry of reason is indeed terrible; is indeed to be dreaded. For if any one wishes to see what speculation comes to, when reason wanders alone into the dark cold spaces of extreme thinking[26],—when analysis alone is set free to act, and synthesis (the balancing imaginative power) is cast in prison, till her time for reprisals be come,—

---

[24] The Christian pastor will not, however, regard these as the highest types of religious people among his flock. He will remember St. Paul's judgment, implied in *ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ* (Rom. xv. 1): and St. Augustine's words: 'Operentur ministri Tui, non . . loquendo per miracula et sacramenta et voces mysticas,—ubi intenta sit ignorantia mater admirationis in timore occultorum signorum; . . sed sint forma fidelibus, vivendo coram iis, et excitando ad imitationem.' (*Confess.* xiii. 21.)

[25] No Church can be in a healthy condition, which is unable to bear free inquiry or bold criticism. *Τὰς ὑποθέσεις τὰς πρῶτας, καὶ εἰ πίσται ὑμῖν εἰσὶν, ὁμῶς ἐπισκέπτεαι σαφέστερον.* (Plato, *Phædo*, lvi. sub fin.) 'Cùm aliquis ad probandam fidem inducit rationes, quæ non sunt cogentes, cadit in irrisionem infidelium. Credunt enim, quòd hujusmodi rationibus innitamur et propter eas credamus.' (Aquinas, *Summa*, i. 32. 1.)

[26] How far astray—into fields which border upon the *ἄτοπον*—Unitarianism is, at least, *tempted* to wander, may perhaps be judged from the following passage: 'The vouchers of religion are the Bible in its general tenor, and the universe in its general influence. The vouchers of theology are the text-books of the schools, and the climate of particular zones of the globe; the *Summa* of Aquinas; the *Institutes* of Calvin and Priestley; the *Mababarata* and *Ramayana* of Hindostan.' (Dr. Beard, ap. *Cycl. Rel. Den.* p. 307.) A Hindoo writer takes one step farther, and condenses these large statements into a small compass: 'Was not Jesus Christ an Asiatic? . . His religion is entitled to our peculiar regard, as an altogether Oriental affair.' (Chunder Sen, *Lectures*, p. 26.)

he must go to a subtler race than ours, to men of a finer brain and a more Eastern faculty of self-abstraction. He must examine that most surprising religious phenomenon, Buddhism; and must follow on, till he shivers at the dread brink of lonely, dark, and vacuous *Nirwana*, which is all the residuum that is left, when reason has done its worst with our conception of a living God, and has reached that abstract 'nothing' which lies a step behind abstract 'existence[27].' And he will then know why it is that—half unconsciously—men of imagination, men who cannot live on space and nothingness, men as 'men' (in short), and as God has made them, hate and shrink from illimitable scepticism. He will then find out why religious men, who feel their pressing need of something better than mere *negations*, on which to stand upright against the terrors and temptations of our earthly life, shudder at those claims of Reason about which we sometimes hear so much; and refuse her pretensions to go all lengths unchecked, to own no allegiance to any one, to bow to no authority, and to shake off all reverence and all faith[28].

---

[27] 'Nirwana is the end of "successive existence;" the arriving at its opposite shore; its completion... Nirwana is not produced by merit or demerit; it cannot be said that it is produced or not produced; that it is past, present, or future... Those who are born as quadrupeds, or sceptics, cannot (in that birth) attain nirwana... The joy of nirwana is unmixed... It is free from danger, safe, without fear, happy, peaceful. When a man who has been broiled before a huge fire, goes quickly into some open space, he feels the most agreeable sensation:..the open space is nirwana.' (Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, p. 292.) 'So sehr sie sonst in der Definition oder Nicht-Definition dieses Begriffs oder Nicht-Begriffs von einander abweichen: Nirwana is die definitive Befreiung. ist der Tod, nach welchem es mit allem Elend des Daseyns ein Ende hat—darin sind alle einig... Es hat keine Gestalt, keine Farbe, weder Raum, noch Zeit... Nicht kommen, nicht gehen, nicht wollen und wünschen. &c. ist Nirwana... Leerheit und Nichtigkeit sind dem Buddhismus das innere Wesen alles Daseyns und Lebens; und diese Nichtigkeit muss zuletzt, nachdem sie die hohle und unwahre Form der Existenz vollständig abgestreift,.. hervortreten.' (Köppen, *Relig. des Buddha*, p. 304.)

[28] A singular forgetfulness is some-

Yes: if a man say to me, 'Why should Reason, which God has given, seem to you *terrible?* or a thing to be 'dreaded?' I reply: 'Nay, thank God! to me, as an English Churchman, it is not either terrible or dreaded. I hail it, as God's *almost* highest gift to man. I fear it not. In distant imitation of the noblest saints in every age, I would rejoice in all its conquests. And on the foremost fringe and perilous outskirts of every scientific advance, I would fain be found,—if I might only bring to the self-denying men who combat there, that which my Church, and God's Spirit teaching therein, have brought home to me. And that precious lesson, that pearl of great price, is this: the calm and profound conviction, that it is only *faithless* reason which is to be mistrusted: that half the truth is not the truth, and half the man is not the true man: and that only when you cultivate *one* department of your nature exclusively, cast away as useless rubbish the helps and 'sacramenta' of your moral sphere, and forget to pose your own soul in attitude of worship,—as you would teach your child to kneel, so that by repeated acts of reverence a thousand faint traces may accumulate into lines of permanent

times noticeable, in quarters where one would least expect it, that the *education* of an immature mind, and the prosecution of a *scientific inquiry*, are two perfectly distinct things: that the former requires faith; the latter scepticism: and that while the former is the work of the Church; the latter is the work of individuals. Thus the Duke of Somerset goes to church, and finds 'an ignorant generation reposed in a paradise of illusions; while its more learned and thoughtful progeny is excruciated with doubt. In vain preachers now exhort to faith. . . The Protestant oftentimes takes up his open Bible; he wishes to believe; he tries to believe. . . All these efforts avail nothing.' (*Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism;* 1872, p. 144.) The Duke and the Protestant are simply trying to do two things at once; and naturally fail in both. Prof. Huxley is *tempted* in the same direction (*Lay Sermons*, &c., p. 21.) But then he is keen enough to suspect some absurdity in the position; and honestly proclaims, that 'the army of liberal thought is, at present, in very loose order; and many a spirited freethinker makes use of his freedom mainly to vent nonsense.' (*Ibid.* p. 69.)

religious character[29],—only then is Reason terrible; only then does the divine and glorious gift of light threaten to become a flame, to burn up the ungodly.'

For, in one word, the powers within us are precisely like those without us,—awful and ruinous without their proper counterpoise, which God their maker intended. How quietly, for instance, we all sit here! How fixed and stable appears the solid ground beneath our feet! How few of us realize the tremendous thought, that (like helpless playthings in our Creator's hands) we and our earth and all the works of fretful man upon it are,—at a speed of 60,000 miles an hour,—darting through space: so that let there be one moment's check, one added grain or two of friction,—and the break-up of this planet into a jostling crowd of shapeless whirling asteroids, would make the worst railway accident we ever heard of no more than a clash of tiny motes within a sunbeam.

And yet, on the other hand, the centripetal forces, which are ever dragging us towards that tremendous furnace the sun, are equally terrible. There, even iron, it seems, exists in a state of vapour[30]. There, rosy flames of hydrogen curl and flicker their thousands of miles in height; and the temperature is computed at 120,000 degrees of heat[31]. How appalling the thought!

---

[29] 'Who has ever calculated the number of *traces* out of which his psychical forms have grown!' (Beneke, *Elements of Psychology*, p. 140, English translation, 1871.) The *ideas* of Space and Time seem to have been generated in man by *constant external contacts* with extension and succession. (H. Spencer, *Psychol.*, i. 467.)

[30] 'Professor Kirchhoff finds iron, calcium, magnesium, sodium, chromium, and other metals to be constituents of the solar atmosphere: but as yet he has been unable to detect gold, silver, mercury, aluminium, tin, lead, arsenic or antimony.' (Tyndall, *On Heat*, p. 415.)

[31] It has been calculated by Zöllner, an Austrian astronomer of high repute, that the temperature at the sun is 123,000° Fahr. (*Gent. Magaz.*, September 1870, p. 513.) The heat given out by each square yard of the

And yet each night, suspended directly above that fearful death[32], we commit ourselves to repose with perfect confidence. We trust in the stability of God's standing purpose of beneficence[33]. And we perceive that it is only when one of these great forces breaks away, and releases itself from the control of the other, that any harm can come. And so we learn to recognize that God's method is *compromise*, not directness; that safety lies, not in one force, but in a resolution of forces; and that,—eagerly as people of one idea are always craving for simplicity, unity, and logical completeness,—these ways are not God's ways, and are sure to lead to some ruinous and (ultimately) illogical result.

I need not, surely, spend time in applying this parable of nature to the subject before us. Unitarianism on the one side, with its entire abnegation of all Creeds,—and Romanism on the other, with its now completed centralization of authority,—are each of them compact and perfect logical systems. While the true system of the Catholic Church seems incomplete, illogical, a mere resolution of irreconcileable forces, a 'compromise.' Yet this, there is every reason to think, is God's way, after all.

---

sun's surface is equivalent to that of 13,500 lbs. of coal per hour: and were the sun abolished, the temperature would finally settle itself at 239° below zero. (Herschel, *Astron.* chap. vii.) The heat at the sun's surface would boil, per hour, 700,000 millions of cubic miles of ice-cold water. (Tyndall, *On Heat*, p. 419.)

[32] 'Without doubt, the whole surface of the sun displays an unbroken ocean of fiery fluid matter. On this ocean rests an atmosphere of glowing gas . . . If the earth struck the sun, it would utterly vanish from perception.' (Tyndall, p. 424.)

[33] 'Omnia portenta contrà naturam dicimus esse. Sed non sunt. Quomodò est enim "contrà naturam" quod Dei fit voluntate,—quum *voluntas* tanti utique Conditoris conditæ rei cujusque *natura* sit? Portentum ergò fit, non contrà naturam, sed contrà quam est nota natura.' (St. Augustine, *de Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8.) A remarkable passage, on more accounts than one. Cf. Theodore Parker, *Discourse of Religion*, p. 130: 'But this *Law*,—what is it but the *will of God*; a mode of divine action?'

To return then to our question: how is it that the Unitarian method, in comparison with that of the Church, seems to fail? The answer seems to be this. The Church (as we have seen in a previous Lecture) claims to be a great Divinely instituted *educational society*. If it be otherwise, then it must be frankly admitted that all these questions are capable of being re-opened. Education however (it is well known) is divisible into two branches: (1) teaching or 'doctrine;' (2) training or 'discipline.' We drop the subject of 'discipline.' Doctrine then may again be subdivided into two departments,—the *speculative*, which prepares it; and the *practical*, which applies it.

Now in both of these two departments, as all those who have studied the subject are aware, *it is of immense importance to have some fixed points to start with.* A hypothesis, a dogma, a provisional form and mould of thought, is found (I believe) in prosecuting any science under the sun, to be absolutely indispensable[34]. And therefore, even so far as theological speculation is concerned, some simple outline of a creed is employed by

[34] The nebular hypothesis, the Darwinian hypothesis, the undulatory theory of light, the glacial hypothesis in surface geology, and many others might be named, as instances of provisional 'dogmas,' put forth under the conviction that no greater boon can be conferred on any science, than to project its ascertained data in a form that the imagination can seize, and can then correct or improve. 'False *facts* are highly injurious to science, . . but false *views*, if supported by some evidence, do little harm; as everybody takes a salutary pleasure in proving their falseness.' (Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 385.) 'Sciences begin in casual observation and *systematic* reasoning: afterwards arrives the epoch of doubt.' (Lewes, *Seaside Studies*, p. 38.) 'A man may have at his fingers' ends the distances, volumes, densities, and so on, of all the planets, . . but unless he has in his mind's eye a *picture* of the solar system, . . he has not yet passed even the threshold of the science.' (Proctor, *On Astronomy*, *Fraser's Mag.*, September 1871.) 'Η μὲν οὖν πίστις σύντομός ἐστιν . . γνῶσις· ἡ γνῶσις δὲ ἀπόδειξις τῶν διὰ πίστεως παρειλημμένων. (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 10. 57.) 'Wer wissen will, ehe denn er glaubt, der kommt nimmer zu wahren Wissen.' (*Deutsche Theologia*, [A.D. 1400,] p. 78.)

the Church, and is really (though not verbally) accepted by all the other religious bodies, as a basis for theological thinking. But still more when we come to practical teaching of the poor and uninstructed and of children, how is it possible to pretend that the Church can ever be rid of creeds? When you are rid of creeds,—short, compendious, time-honoured, authoritative forms, well suited for unauthoritative, varied, many-sided expansion,—what do you get instead? 'Catechisms' longer and shorter, formulæ drawn up by 'Congregational Unions' and 'Baptist Unions,' 'Mr. Wesley's Sermons,' and a hundred such things. And these, while verbally disclaiming all pretensions to authority, any one can see have an irresistible tendency to become *tests of doctrine* for their respective societies, and much more elaborate tests than anything which the Church imposes upon her members [35].

For what *does* the Church impose upon her members? I believe there exists the greatest possible misapprehension upon this subject: and that the mass of half-educated people believe that—if they have not already in some occult way been made to sign the Thirty-nine Articles—at least they must be prepared, as members

[35] The Presbyterian 'Westminster Confession' is contained in thirty-three articles, and (with Scripture proofs) covers 108 pages, 4to. The Independent 'Declaration of Faith,' &c., is drawn up also in thirty-three articles. The Romanist 'Creed of Pope Pius IV.' contains eleven articles in addition to the Nicene Creed. The Baptist 'Confession of Faith' is in thirty-two chapters, and occupies thirty-five pages in Mr. Spurgeon's edition. The Quaker has a 'Confession of Faith, containing twenty-three articles,' by Robert Barclay (Evans's *Exposition*, p. 67). The Unitarian 'Negative elements of our belief' are four only, and very brief (Martineau, *Studies*, p. 77): the positive ones, as described by Dr. Beard, appear to be eight or nine (*Cyclop. Rel. Den.* p. 301). The Wesleyan 'Standard Doctrines,' imposed by the Conference on every minister in the connexion, are contained in Mr. Wesley's four volumes of Sermons, covering (in the reprint of 1838) 1469 pages of close print; and his 'Notes on the New Testament' occupying (with the text, post 8vo., edit. 1869) 700 pages in addition.

of the Church of England, at any moment to subscribe to every statement in them. Such has been the result of our false and improper use of these things, so long persisted in! But what is the truth of the matter? It is, that *the only theological formula which a Church of England layman is called upon—from his baptism till the hour of his death—to assent to, is 'The Apostles' Creed*[36].' That, and that alone, is required at his baptismal admission within the Church: that, and that alone, is asked for at the death-bed, as a sufficient proof that the man retains what he originally began with—the Christian's confession of a true faith.

And that Creed, Mr. Biddle the Unitarian in the seventeenth century, Mr. Emlyn in the eighteenth, and (I believe) a great many of the best Unitarians at the present day, profess themselves quite ready to accept[37]. As to the other Creeds,—they stand in the Prayer-book as triumphant hymns of orthodoxy; and therefore are of a more elaborate and florid doctrinal type. They stand there to be *sung* in divine worship,—not to be *subscribed.* And as for the *Thirty-nine Articles*,—their proper usage is as a τύπος διδαχῆς, a sketch or framework of sound doctrine, by which the Church takes engagements from her clergy and other teaching officers, that—while occu-

[36] 'The Church hath power to intend our faith, but not to ex-tend it; to make our belief more evident, but not more large and comprehensive.. If we have found out what foundation Christ and His Apostles did lay, —i.e. what body and system of Articles they taught and required us to believe,—we need not, we cannot go any farther.' (Jeremy Taylor, *Liberty of Proph.* p. 20.) 'Our own Church requires from its lay members no confession of their faith, except that contained in the Apostles' Creed.' (Bishop Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 11): see Prayer-book, Baptismal and Visitation Services.

[37] 'If a Socinian were to make a confession of his faith, he would do it in no other words but these of the Apostles.' (Biddle, *Brief History*, p. 8.) 'This was wont to be the sufficient test of Christianity and Church Communion; which I willingly assent to, in its plain and fair sense.' (Emlyn, *Narrative*, Appendix, p. lxiii.)

pying her pulpits and teaching in her name—they will not be disloyal; but will teach in her spirit, and present her time-honoured doctrine, albeit in sundry forms and divers manners to her people. For, observe, should they contravene these Articles, she does not excommunicate them. She simply bids them cease from teaching in her name, and be content with lay-communion [38].

How then can the Church's use of Creeds and Articles be accused of tyranny and usurpation? Practically, the most widely used Unitarian Prayer-book [39] in London

[38] E.g. this was the case lately with Mr. Heath, in the diocese of Winchester; and Mr. Voysey, in the diocese of York. They were adjudged, in an open court of law, to have contravened the Church's *Articles* in their public teaching; and were simply deprived of their position as 'teachers' in her name. 'Our Articles and other formularies are not tests of communion; they are means by which the congregation of Christ's flock is preserved from error in the teaching of the minister.' (Canon Swainson, *On Authority of New Testament*, p. 274.) 'By subscription it was not meant that people should never alter their minds: but only that the person subscribing held certain definite and intelligible views, with respect to the truth he was to *teach;* and that, if he afterwards changed his mind, he should be prepared to lay down the office that he held.' (Bishop Wilberforce, speech in House of Lords, 1862.)

[39] 'The Prayer-book for the use of the Unitarian Congregation in Little Portland Street.' This Service-book is interesting for many reasons. It contains a choice of ten services for Morning and Evening Prayer, constructed on the model of the Church's book; but with all 'creeds' omitted, from objections 'on principle to making definitions of belief part of the act of worship.' (*Preface*, p. vii.) Many of the 'occasional prayers' are exceedingly good. At the Communion, consecration takes place by reciting 1 Cor. xi. 23-26. In delivering the bread, &c., there are three alternative forms: (1) 'Take and eat this, in remembrance of Christ:' (2) 'As a solemn testimony, in the presence of each other and before God, of our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, let us take and eat of this bread, in remembrance of Him.' (3) 'This bread is our Lord's own emblem of His body which was broken for us. Take, eat, in remembrance of Him.' Afterwards comes a sort of 'Church Militant Prayer;' containing, 'we remember those who have fallen asleep in Christ,' &c. Indeed, such remembrance is purposely made a special feature in all the services. (*Preface*, p. xiii.) At Baptism, there are four alternative forms: (1) 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.' (2) 'I baptize thee in the name of Jesus Christ.' (3) I dedicate thee to the kingdom of God, through His Son Jesus Christ.' (4) 'In the name of Jesus Christ, I dedicate thee to God, our Father in heaven.' Then follows an address to the parents: 'Let me remind you, that what you are your-

confesses the very same need, which the Church has thus tried to meet. For the preface to that book states, that 'it is prepared for a body of Christians, who own the importance both of *definite* individual conviction, and of broad average *concurrence* among the members of the same Church.' Yet surely, these important blessings are precisely those which the Church of England has been aiming to secure to her people. And as far as free speculation is concerned,—surely, the press is open; speech is free; even her teaching officers are far more unfettered, than they are in any other community that has lasted so long, and that disclaims so vigorously the rightfulness of 'secession.' And more than this: I will be bold to add, that if, after really examining and understanding the matter, any individual man is able to offer to the Church a *better* solution of the subtle and perplexing problems that environ us on every side, than those which the incessant labour and consummate skill of sixty generations have evolved,—the Church for her part will be only too thankful to take such a solution into her most careful consideration; and by individual aid (as she has often done before) to improve the methods of her teaching [40].

For surely it comes to this, after all: that it is not so much her teaching, as the *method* of her teaching, to which the Unitarian objects. He claims more freedom.

---

selves . . is a commentary whereby your direct teaching will be interpreted,' &c.

[40] What the Church demands in such cases is, that the intellectual acumen of the individual be balanced and kept from schismatical arrogance, by the Christian and moral virtues of patience, modesty, and by faith in Christ as the unseen yet not inactive Head and Ruler of the Church. Subject to these conditions, she has warmly welcomed the aid of individual thinkers: such as Athanasius the deacon, Leo the Pope, Augustine the Bishop, (cf. Nicolas, *Le Symbole des Apôtres*, p. 197), Anselm the monk, Aquinas the friar, Erasmus the layman, Hooker the priest, and a multitude of others.

He protests, for instance, against the 'Divinity,' i. e. the divine character and mission of our Lord Jesus Christ, —which he, it seems, in words confesses, as well as ourselves [41],—being set forth in the terminology of metaphysics, as it is at present set forth in the Church.

But it would not, I think, be difficult to show two things: (1) that the Church has been driven to do this quite *unwillingly* [42] (though perhaps providentially), by the onset of anti-Christian metaphysics, in the earlier centuries; and that watchfulness against similar phenomena is not wholly unnecessary at the present day: and (2) (what is far more important), that the real secret of her successful teaching and training of mankind, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, is simply this,—that she has addressed herself to the *whole* nature of man [43], and balanced the possible mischief of one force

[41] E. g. Mr. Vance Smith writes to the *Daily News*, on Feb. 20, 1871, as follows: 'Some speakers . . appear to have resented my participation, much as if they thought I had intended to offer some indignity to the Church and to do a dishonour to the Church's Divine Head. I would earnestly repudiate such a construction.'—Dr. Beard tells us, 'regarding the person of Christ, various opinions are held by Unitarians, . . ranging from the high Arianism of Milton to the simple Humanitarianism of Belsham; corresponding alike to the pre-existent Logos of John, and the "man approved of God" of Luke. There are other Unitarians who decline speculating on the point.' (*Cycl. Rel. Den.* p. 302.)

[42] See, for the Eastern Church, Cyril Jer., *Cat. Lect.* xi. 12: Πολλὰ ζητήματα ἐστὶν ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· τὸ γεγραμμένον οὐ καταλαμβάνομεν, τί τὸ μὴ γεγραμμένον πολυπραγμονοῦμεν; αὐτάρκες ἡμὶν εἰδέναι ὅτι Θεὸς ἐγέννησε Υἱὸν ἕνα μόνον. Μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῆς ὁμολογησαὶ τὴν ἄγνοιαν,—ἐπειδὴ μετὰ ἀγγέλων ἀγνοεῖς. For the Western Church, Aug. *de Trin.* ii. 1: 'Cùm homines Deum quærunt, et ad intelligentiam Trinitatis (pro captu infirmitatis humanæ) animum intendunt, . . cùm ad aliquid certum, discussâ omni ambiguitate, pervenerint,—facillimè debent ignoscere errantibus in tanti pervestigatione secreti.'

[43] 'There is surely an evil inseparable from all *partial* developments of religion,—which only satisfy the immediate cravings of the mind, and leave parts of our nature — asleep perhaps at the moment — liable to wake and thirst again.' (James Martineau, *Studies of Christianity*, p. 410.) 'With a "Faith" traditionally shy of morals, and "Morals" not yet elevated into faith, we have two separate codes of life standing in presence of each other — one religious, the other secular—and neither

by the compensating influence of another. She has not, like the Puritans, preached 'faith only' to the Conscience; not, like the modern Romanists, allowed the forces of mere Imagination and representation to run riot; nor, lastly, like the Unitarians and the men of the eighteenth century, addressed the Reason almost exclusively, and held (to use Bishop Warburton's language) that 'the image of God in which man was created lay in the faculty of reason only[44].'

No: surely the Church's method has been admirable indeed, when compared with all of these. She seems to have been led, (may we not suppose by His guidance, who 'knoweth whereof we are made,') to recognize that fact, which all modern psychology seems to point to, that man's inner nature may be partitioned, and the innumerable flashing mobile acts and feelings of his brain be registered, under three grand divisions,—his CONSCIENCE, his IMAGINATION, and his REASON[45]; of which the conscience, or moral department,—like the central shoot of some dicotyledinous plant,—may (in a sense) be called the man's true self, the αὐτὸς ἐγὼ of St. Paul. On this, the moral, central, growing soul, the Sun of

---

of them with any true foundations in human nature as a *whole*.' (*Ibid.* p. 338.)

[44] Bishop Warburton, *Works*, iii. 620, (quoted in *Essays and Reviews*, p. 269).

[45] 'Aristotle, the first systematic expositor of the science [of psychology], enumerates .. the threefold division of the facts of consciousness into *sensation*, *thought*, and *volition*.' (Cycl. Brit., art. *Metaphysics*, p. 555.) The first of these is the raw-material of the plastic 'imagination:' 'The æsthetic feelings are a union between external impressions and emotions already existent within us. They are produced by our not stopping at the sensible impressions made by things, but by pushing on to their internal being and life; by our thinking of their internal nature as analogous to our own; and thus spiritualizing the objects of sense.' (Beneke, *Elements of Psychology*, ed. Dressler, 1871, p. 140.) For physiological indications of the same truth, see the profoundly interesting researches of M. Flourens, *De la phrénologie et des études vraies sur le cerveau* (1863), pp. 149, 151, 191.

Righteousness, when once it has arisen and been presented with power, beams with a marvellous fecundity. The soul stirs and thrills and ascends beneath the transforming beam. It reaches out as yet all blindly, as if to feel after and find that wondrous source, whence life and awakening have come to her[46]. And therefore it is, that the Church has always made it her first—I had almost said, her single and all-comprehending—duty to *present* Christ, for the grasp of men's faith to reach hold of[47]; to awaken men; to stimulate into a responsive activity their sluggish moral sense, by pouring on them 'with the power of an endless life' that beam, with which the effluence from no other source has ever yet, for stimulating power, come for a moment into competition[48].

But still, even when this has been done, all is not done. The growing plant is not all shoot. It must be ministered to by its lateral root-leaves, which gather for it and fix from the surrounding air its fitting and natural nutriment. And so too it is with the man. He

[46] I cannot refrain from quoting here the noblest passage which perhaps ever welled forth—like water-springs out of a dry ground—from amid the arid pages of modern Metaphysics: 'Duty! thou great, thou exalted name' Wondrous thought, that workest neither by fond insinuation, flattery, nor by any threat; but merely by holding up thy naked law in the soul, and so extorting for thyself always reverence, if not obedience! before whom all "appetites" are dumb, however secretly they rebel! *Whence* thy original?.. Verily, it can be nothing less than what advances man, as part of the physical system, above himself; connecting him with an order of things unapproached by "sense," into which the force of reason can alone pierce.' (Kant, *Metaphysic of Ethics*, 1797, p. 120, translated by Semple;—transferred to this work, by the author, from his *Kritik der Pract. Vernunft.*)

[47] Alas, that we clergy should so often,—from want of knowledge or from defect of skill,—fail thus to 'preach Christ!' Happily, it often occurs that amid our preaching (to use George Herbert's words) 'God takes a text:' or that (as St. Augustine fancifully interprets Genesis, in his *Confess.* xiii. 18) 'transeunt nubes: cœlum manet.'

[48] 'Und so der einzig wahre Messias! der einzige, zu dem—als Führer und Herrn—jeder stets *emporblicken* und emporstreben muss, den (sei es sinnend, oder arbeitend, oder leidend) rein und vollkommen zu Gott selbst zu streben, der Geist zieht!' (Ewald, *Volk Israel*, v. p. 448.)

too is in danger of some morbid growth, of developing into some blind fanaticism or helpless casuistical scrupulosity, unless sweet health and joy be brought him through the other functions of his manifold nature. First of all, his imaginative cravings for re-presentation must be fed; and Art, the great teacher of what is truly beautiful, must be freely and boldly used, to gather from the surrounding world all forms of loveliness and purity, and devote them to this highest service[49]. And this too (I need not say), the Church has faithfully done. She has repudiated all Montanistic dread of art and imaginative cultivation. She has taken freely, and with filial boldness, all that was in the air (so to speak) of beauty from time to time. She began with what she found, ready to her hand,—the forms of synagogue worship: she then drew from the Temple: and then from the Hellenic and the (so-called) Gothic forms: enlisted the Ambrosian and Gregorian and Palestrinian music: took painting and sculpture and evolved the ritual drama of the altar and the font: was afraid of none of these things,—because she truly felt, all common things were cleansed for her, that 'all things were hers.' And so it came to pass that, with sweet and healthful pleasure, the great central redeeming verities were taken up and appropriated by thousands of her childlike souls[50], in whom the conscience had yet to

---

[49] 'La foi de notre siècle est une foi non formulée: l'Art a, de nos ours, une fonction religieuse supérieure à celle du théologien.' (Renan, *Études d'histoire*, p. 430.)

'Was wir als Schönheit hier empfunden,
Wird einst als Wahrheit uns entgegen gehen.'
(Schiller, *Gedichte*, p. 95.)

[50] Read the beautiful language of the true *Fathers* and teachers of the Church in olden time: σχῆμα τοῦτ' ἔστιν .. ἵνα εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τοῦτο παιδευτήριον εἰσελθεῖν δυνηθῶμεν. Ἀλλ' ἔνδον ὁ κρυπτὸς ἐνοικεῖ Πατὴρ, καὶ ὁ τούτου Παῖς ὁ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανὼν. . . Ἀλλὰ σύ γε μὴ ἐξαπατηθῇς, ὁ γεγευ-

be fully awakened, and in whom the adult reason perchance would never wake at all [51].

But even this was not enough. There remained yet a fraction of the human race,—and those, in some respects, the highest and strongest, in others (as they themselves but too well know) the weakest and most tempted of mankind,—men 'puffed up,' not 'built up [52];' men whose intellect is bright and keen, while their imagination is (in many cases) neglected, and their moral faculty all but asleep. Shall the Church show no consideration for *them* [53]? Has Christ no word of pity for them,—

---

μένος ἀληθείας! ἀλλὰ,—τὸ ἐναντίον τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις,—σεαυτῷ κατάλεξον στρατὸν ἄοπλον, ἀπόλεμον . . τοιούτους κτῆσαι τῇ ψυχῇ δορυφόρους. (Clem. Alex., *Quis Dives*, § 33.)

'The prayers of hungry souls and poor,
Like armed angels at the door,
Our unseen foes appal.'
(*Christian Year*, First Sunday after Easter.)

Ὡς γὰρ ἀγαθὸς διδάσκαλος, κηδόμενος τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῶν, τοὺς μὴ δυναμένους ἐκ τῶν μειζόνων ὠφεληθῆναι, πάντως διὰ τῶν εὐτελεστέρων συγκαταβαίνων αὐτοὺς παιδεύει,—οὕτως καὶ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος. κ. τ. λ. (Athanasius, *de Incarn. Verbi*, § 15: Migne, i. 121.)

[51] Contrast the hard repulsive language of the *Westminster Confession*, Art. xxix. [Appendix B, p. 124]: 'All ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with Him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table.' We seem to hear the echoes of the very earliest extant heretical work, the Judaizing *Clementine Homilies*. p. 15 (ed. Dressel): Τὰ πρώτεια τῆς κολάσεως τοῖς ἐν πλάνῃ οὖσιν ἀποδίδοται,—κἂν σωφρόνωσιν.

[52] Ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ· ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. (1 *Cor.* viii. 1.) 'Eo infirmiores, quo doctiores videri volunt.' (Aug. *de Doctr.* ii. 13.)

[53] I know of nothing, among all the deeply interesting social phenomena of the present day,—so stimulating to the best energies of every Christian minister who is worthy of the name, as the half-acknowledged appeals which are now constantly being made for *spiritual* help by scientific men. The attitude of Science towards Faith is no longer one of buoyant arrogance. 'Just as fire and water require an intervening substance, to become harmless to one another, Reason and Faith can coexist only on the condition that a proper consciousness of the limits of the human intellect is powerful enough to bind them over to keep the peace.' (*Westminster Review*, Oct. 1862, p. 480.) 'When I look at the heavens and the earth, . . and ask myself, "Is there no Being or thing in the universe, that knows more about these matters, than I do?" what is my answer? Supposing

Christ who at the Sadducee is never known to have levelled one shaft of stern rebuke, and who, from the ranks of the δυνατοὶ, the flower and crown of intellectual cultivation, called his most successful apostle, St. Paul? Surely it is not so. And whatever neglect, in this matter, the guardians of the modern Church may have one day to answer for, neither the ancient nor yet the mediæval Church can for one moment be accused of indolence or apathy in making intellectual provision for these men's souls.

For from every philosophy, as it successively sprang up, did the great thinkers of those times employ their utmost energies to draw, and fix for the Church's use, whatever was most pure and sound and available. The first at hand was Rabbinism; and it was freely used

---

our theological schemes to be dissipated, . . is such a condition one of stable equilibrium?' (Tyndall, *Fragments of Science*, p. 124.) 'In this sadness, this consciousness of the limitation of man, this sense of an open secret which he cannot penetrate, lies the essence of all religion; and the attempt to embody it in the forms furnished by the intellect is the origin of the higher theologies." (Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, &c. p. 15.) 'Why is it more irreligious, to explain the origin of man, as a distinct species, by descent from some lower form, . . than to explain the birth of an individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction?' (Darwin, *Descent of Man*, ii. 395.) 'Doubt and controversy are painful things; but they are growing-pains, —they are marks, not of decay, but of life and vigour.' (*Pall Mall Gaz.*, Dec. 5, 1866.) Hence the despair of thoughtful men, in Roman Catholic countries, at the attitude taken up by their Church. 'Le péril imminent, celui qu'il faut écarter par tous les actes que la foi autorise, c'est la separation entre la hierarchie catholique et la civilization moderne.' (Chevalier, *Mexique.*)—'Ah, quel sombre avenir tout cela me montre déjà pour le Catholicisme! Que d'âmes sont brisées! Que d'esprits d'élite se refuseront bientôt à accepter la responsabilité redoubtable du ministère!' (*Le Maudit*, i. 80.)—Hence the joyous hopefulness of men under happier circumstances of religious freedom,—of Germans, who have found that 'ernster und gewissenhafter Gebrauch der Vernunft den Glauben stärkt' (Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, i. p. xxxiv); and of Englishmen, who believe that 'it is the happy distinction of this country, that what is *new* in it does not require to forswear brotherhood with what is *old;* and that no higher duty, and none more fruitful of reward, can attach to any of us, than the effort to harmonize these two powers together.' (Gladstone, *Speech at Manchester*, 1864.)

by St. Paul. Then came Platonism, and the Λόγος doctrine of the Alexandrian lecture-rooms. Then the Aristotle of the Saracens. Then the true Hellenic Aristotle and Plato,—neither abridged by Alexandria, nor diluted by Semitic translation. Then the Baconian induction. And lastly, the Kantian metaphysics,—the noblest, ripest, and most essentially Christian, probably, of them all. And not only philosophy, but all the subordinate sciences too, which are occupied with the laws and phenomena of 'existence,'—from that of man down to the very lowest animals and plants,—were once (and why should they not be again[54]?) consecrated to God, and their first, best, purest fruits brought in from the great scientific harvest, and waved by theology in the temple of the Author and Giver of them all. Only, in these days, we seem too apathetic or too cowardly for this: and Oxford, where Luther's three conditions for an efficient theology ('tentatio, oratio, meditatio') surely abound, produces few theologians[55]. And so it needed the stimulus of the Unitarian (and that a not very unfriendly) attack to awaken us once more.

For,—say what men will,—it is impossible for any observant man to believe that the separation of the Unitarians from the Church is a fundamental or a permanent one. Let us take, for instance, their own especial subject of dispute, viz. (what they call) the Church's

---

[54] . . . 'I walked on, musing with myself
On life and art,—and whether, after all,
A larger metaphysics might not help
Our physics, a completer poetry
Adjust our daily life and vulgar wants
More fully, than the special outside plans.'
(Mrs. Browning, *Aurora Leigh*, p. 236.)

[55] 'Of all academical institutions, Oxford is at once the most imperfect, and the most perfectible.' (Sir W. Hamilton, *Lectures*, p. 387.)

'*metaphysical*' conception of the Holy Trinity. They repudiate this doctrine,—because it seems to them to contravene that particular truth, which they have set themselves the task of defending, viz. the Divine 'Unity.' But have they ever considered this absolutely certain—though it may be to some people an astonishing and, at first sight, unwelcome—fact, *that it was purely and entirely in defence of the unbroken and inviolable 'Unity' of God, that the whole doctrine of the 'Trinity' was evolved by the Church*[56] *?*

Yes: so profoundly has the Church always believed, so firmly and tenaciously has she always grasped, so clearly and faithfully has she always taught, this great

---

[56] This fact was recognized so early as A.D. 200, and even—in spite of the *στενότητα τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς γλωττῆς καὶ ὀνομάτων πενίαν* (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 21)—within the Latin Church. 'Simplices quique, ne dicam imprudentes et idiotæ (quæ major semper credentium pars est),—quoniam et ipsa regula fidei à pluribus Diis sæculi ad unicum et verum Deum transfert,—expavescunt ad *οἰκονομίαν*. "Monarchiam," inquiunt, "tenemus!"' (Tertullian, *c. Praxeam*, § 3.)—It was recognized by the great Athanasius himself, in the fourth century: *Μίαν ἀρχὴν οἴδαμεν. Τὸν δὲ δημιουργὸν Λόγον φάσκομεν οὐκ ἕτερόν τινα τρόπον ἔχειν Θεότητος, ἢ τὴν τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ. Μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν οἱ Ἀρειομανῖται δικαίως ἂν σχοῖεν τὸ ἔγκλημα τῆς πολυθεότητος . . πολλοὺς γὰρ ἂν εἰσάγοιεν, διὰ τὸ 'ἑτεροειδὲς' αὐτῶν. . . Ἕνα γὰρ διὰ τῆς Τριάδος ὁμολογοῦμεν εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν· καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον εὐσεβέστερον λέγομεν, τῆς πολυειδοῦς καὶ πολυμεροῦς τῶν αἱρετικῶν θεότητος. Ὅτι τὴν ΜΙ'ΑΝ ἐν Τριάδι θεότητα φρονοῦμεν. . . Εἰ γὰρ 'Θεὸν' αὐτὸν* [scil. *τὸν Λόγον*] *ὀνομάζουσιν, ἐντρεπόμενοι παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν,—ἀνάγκη λέγειν αὐτοὺς δύο θεοὺς.* (Athan. *Orat.* iii. § 15.)—It was pointed out afresh by Petavius, to the Latin Church, in the seventeenth century: 'Verùm, ut divini illius arcani stupenda majestas et admirabilitas magis eluceat,—dicam id, quod præter opinionem fortasse lectori accidat: tantum abesse, ut unitatem simplicitatem Dei personarum discrimen illud interpellet, . ut hæc *ipsa realis personarum differentia ad id potissimùm conferat, ut sit unus* imprimis ac simplicissimus Deus.' (Petav. *de Theol. Dogm.* i. 4. 6: A.D. 1644.)—And, of late years, it has been clearly stated to the English Church once more: 'The Father is the one simple entire Divine Being; and so is the Son. They do, in no sense, share Divinity between them. Each is *ὅλος Θεός*. This is not ditheism, or tritheism; for they are the *same* God. . . In truth, the distinction into "Persons,"—as Petavius remarks,—avails especially towards the unity and simplicity of God.' (Dr. Newman, *Athan. Treatises*, ii. p. 334, note.)

and fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity,—that, in one brief word, she has made it the foundation-stone of all Christianity[57]. By word and by deed, by homily and symbol and sacrament, by creed and treatise and liturgy, by catechisms for babes, by 'Articles' for the clergy, by controversies and polemics innumerable for the learned,—she has striven, for eighteen hundred years and more, to bring the doctrine home to heart and mind. And, with inconceivable expenditure of toil and thought, has cleared away the ever-recurring impediments to its reception[58].

And was she not justified in so doing? Yes: *Monotheism is an essential characteristic of the Gospel.* To teach *that* it was that St. Paul threaded his way among the idols at Athens, and fought with beasts at Ephesus. To teach *that*, Gregory sent his mission to our forefathers, and Boniface carried on the torch of faith from England into Germany. *That* is the opening trumpet-note of the Nicene creed. For *that* it was, that the whole Nicene and Athanasian terminology was invented. For *that* its champion stood up against immeasurable odds—'Athanasius contra mundum.' And hence it is that the

[57] 'Species eorum quæ per prædicationem Apostolicam manifestè traduntur, istæ sunt: primò,—quòd Deus *unus* est.' (Origen, περὶ ἀρχῶν, i. 4.) 'Manifestum est, quòd Deus maximè *unus*.' (Aquinas, *Summa*, i. 11. 4.) 'Our God is one,—or rather, very *oneness* and mere unity.' (Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* i. 2. 2.) 'This *unity* of the Godhead will easily appear as necessary as the existence; so that it must be as impossible that there should be more Gods than one, as that there should be none.' (Pearson, on *Ap. Creed*, Art. i. p. 32, Oxf. ed.) 'The *unity* of God is the foundation of the Gospel: and anything, that may in any way affect this truth, is dangerous.' (Courayer, ap. Kippis' *Life of Lardner*, p. xx.) 'Christianity is the religion of *Monotheism;* and is distinguished from Judaism by its universality.' (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, ii. 353, English trans.)

[58] 'So numerous and serious have been the errors of theorists on religious subjects, . . that the correction of them has required the most vigorous and subtle exercise of the reason. . . What an extreme exercise of intellect is shown in the theological teaching of the Church!' (Newman, *Univ. Serm.* p. 49.)

Church of England, in her very first Article, instructs her clergy and bids her clergy instruct her people, to beware of Tritheism or of any other form of thinking concerning God,—than that He is absolutely and indivisibly ONE. For if Christ be,—as we all confess alike,—in any sense 'Divine;' if He be the irresistible claimant of the heart's supreme devotion and of the soul's supreme obedience,—then the only safe way in which that resistless moral instinct can be satisfied, without trenching upon Monotheism, is by acknowledging Him as (in some mysterious way) the ONE TRUE GOD, manifesting Himself in human nature and in human history [59]. And, on the other hand, every conception (call it by whatever name you will) which militates against this absolute and adorable 'unity,' is just as much a 'heresy' and a rejection of Christianity, as it is to disbelieve the story of the Evangelists, or to dissipate the historical facts of the Gospel into a cloud of legend.

But if this be so, then—in mind and intention—the Unitarian is entirely in agreement with the Church. Every victory he gains over gross and divided conceptions of the divine nature, are her victories too [60]. Every aid

[59] Thus Dionysius, Bishop of Rome (†269), rebukes the 'Arians before Arius' of his day, as *διαιροῦντας καὶ κατατέμνοντας καὶ ἀναιροῦντας τὸ σεμνότατον κήρυγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας,—τὴν μοναρχίαν,—εἰς τρεῖς δυνάμεις τινὰς, καὶ μεμερισμένας ὑποστάσεις.* (ap. *Routh*, iii. 373.)—And a Greek divine of the following century urges, *Τήροιτο δ' ἂν εἰς Θεὸς,—εἰς ἐν Αἴτιον καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ἀναφερομέναν.* (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 29.)—And another, centuries later, argues, *βούλησις καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὁ Υἱός ἐστι τοῦ Πατρός· οὐ χρὴ γὰρ λέγειν ἐπὶ Θεοῦ 'ποιότητα,'—ἵνα μὴ σύνθετον εἴπωμεν Αὐτὸν ἐξ οὐσίας καὶ ποιότητος.* (Johannes Damasc., *De Fide Orth.* i. cap. 13.)—And so too the Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries: 'Nihil sumus aliud "Christiani," nisi—magistro Christo—*Summi Regis ac Principis veneratores.* Nihil, si consideres, aliud invenies in istâ religione versari. Hæc totius summa est actionis, hic propositus terminus divinorum officiorum, hic finis, huic omnes prosternimur, hunc collatis precibus adoramus.' (Arnobius, *c. Gentes*, i. 27.)

[60] 'Fide rectissimè ac robustissimè retinemus, Patrem, Filium, Spiritum

he can supply, towards clearing and strengthening the doctrine of the Divine unity, is an aid towards the final prevalence of her teaching. Every contribution he can make, towards the patient and honest investigation of those historical records, on which her whole teaching is built, is an additional security against the intrusion of falsehood and error in that teaching. Nor need he fear that any such contributions—if they be found, on reflection, to be sound and trustworthy—would fail to be built into that doctrinal structure of 'gold, silver, and costly stones,' upon which she is ever at work; and which is cemented, age after age, by the life-exhausting brain-toil of her sons; that the poor and ignorant and childlike may dwell there without fear, and may enjoy a mental rest, to procure which these 'fellow-workers with Christ' did not refuse their lives. Many a good work, besides Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, has been adopted and widely used by Churchmen, in spite of Unitarian authorship. Nor have the noble words of St. Augustine ever been denied or repudiated: 'Ex *quâcunque* animâ verum consilium procedat, non ei—sed Illi qui est Veritas—tribuendum est.'

And if it should still be complained,—'why so much endless subtlety and *metaphysical* elaboration[61]?'—per-

---

Sanctum, inseparabilem esse Trinitatem,—unum Deum, *non tres Deos*.' (Aug. *Serm.* lii. § 2.)—'De Personarum in S. Trinitate unitate specificâ, qualis est unio personarum in rebus creatis, *e. g. trium hominum*, . . . primævi Ecclesiæ doctores ne somniarunt quidem.' (Bull, *Opera Lat.*, p. 268.)

[61] What is 'Metaphysics'?—The *popular* answer to this question, if it could be reduced to intelligible terms, would probably be very surprising. The true definition has been given by Bishop Hampden: 'We would define the science . . as *the philosophy of the facts of consciousness*; [α] considered subjectively, in relation to the mind knowing, (Psychology): and [β] objectively, in relation to the

haps the answer would be furnished by a little deeper reflection on the nature and the needs of mankind[62]. The idea of 'God' is, confessedly, the apex and crowning point of all the lines which form the pyramid of human knowledge. And the only admissible idea of God being a monotheistic one,—that is to say, being a single and uncompounded conception,—unless *all* the converging lines find there a final rest and satisfaction, a sense of incompleteness arises[63]. Some lines still fall outside that which pretends to cap them all. And there is danger lest, along those neglected lines, the restless intellect of man project for itself new and inharmonious conceptions, incompatible with Christianity, and detrimental to the great vital truth of THE UNITY OF GOD.

Now—say what men will in its disparagement—it cannot be denied that Metaphysics is one of the main lines of human thinking. It is indeed the ruling and 'architectonic' science, among those that are concerned with Existences,—whether the phenomena of their *existence* be reported to us through the senses, or otherwise. Just as Astronomy seems to be, at present, the acknowledged queen of all the sciences connected with the measurement of *space:* and History the chief of all those

---

thing known, (Ontology).' *Cyclop. Brit.* xiv. 555.—Again, '*Physical* science does not trouble itself with the inquiry, whether the objects which it investigates are real or apparent . . In *Metaphysical* science, on the other hand, consciousness itself is the direct object of our inquiries.' (*Ibid.* p. 556.)

[62] 'A study of history shews that the Church arrived at the Catholic statement of the doctrine of the Trinity . . partly because it was the only statement which, recognizing the fact of the Incarnation of the Divine Word, was found at once to satisfy the instincts of a devout belief and the requirements of a true philosophy.' (Prof. Lightfoot, *On revision of E. V.*, p. 84.)

[63] Εἰ μὴ 'οὐσιώδης' σοφία, καὶ 'ἐνούσιος' λόγος, καὶ 'ὢν' υἱός; . . εἴη ἂν αὐτὸς ὁ Πατὴρ σύνθετος ἐκ σοφίας καὶ λόγου. (Athan. *c. Arianos*, lib. v.) 'Omnis res quæ non est Divina *essentia*, est creatura. Patet ergò, quòd in Deo non est aliud *esse relationis* et *esse essentiæ*,—sed unum et idem.' (Aquinas, *Summa*, i. 28, n.)

which are concerned with *time* and succession (geologic or human). Without laying too much stress however on these notions, the fact at least does not admit of doubt, that not merely are 'space' and 'time' (as Kant[64] has taught us) the ultimate forms of human thought, but that 'existence' is yet a third and more subtle form, which lies deeper than the other two. And hence the science which deals with this subject is a true science,—so long (at least) as it adheres to scientific methods of procedure, and gathers its material mainly from that one *interior* nature which alone is submitted to its scrutiny—the nature of man[65].

But Christianity distinctly and repeatedly asserts, that this nature of *man* was formed 'in the image and likeness of *God*.' So that a transition becomes possible from metaphysics to theology[66]. And the truth should begin to dawn upon us, which has been often strangely forgotten: viz. that the religious problem before us is not, from the *known* Being and Nature of God to deduce the *unknown* nature of Christ; but rather precisely the

[64] 'There are two pure forms of sensuous intuition, as principles of knowledge *à priori*,—viz. Space and Time.' (Kant, *Critik of Pure Reason*, p. 23: Bohn.)

[65] 'Une croyance morale . . . ne saurait prétendre à l'autorité impersonelle de la science, et s'énoncer en ces termes: *Il est certain* que Dieu existe. Mais elle brille d'une sorte d'évidence personelle, qui permet à tout être moral de déclarer: *Je suis certain* qu'il existe un Dieu.' (Bartholmess, *Doctrines religieuses de la Phil. moderne*, i. 359.)—'God, Freedom, and Immortality vanish so soon as men open their eyes only to what is *without* them, and refuse to reflect upon the wonders evident *within*.' (Chandler, *Inaug. Lect.* [1867], p. 23.)

[66] Even in Aristotle we find the two names used interchangeably. *Τρεῖς ἂν εἶεν φιλοσοφίαι θεωρητικαί· μαθηματική, φυσική, θεολογική* . . *Εἰ μὲν οὖν μή ἐστί τις ἑτέρα οὐσία, παρὰ τὰς φύσει συνεστηκυίας, ἡ φυσικὴ ἂν εἴη πρώτη ἐπιστήμη. Εἰ δ' ἐστί τις οὐσία ἀκίνητος, αὕτη προτέρα καὶ φιλοσοφία πρώτη.* (Arist. *Metaph.* v. 1.) It is true that 'the distinction between the divine and human was far less marked to the Greek, than to ourselves.' (Jowett, *Plato*, i. 393.) But it may be, that herein it is *we* who are in error; and that, under the long reign of a biblical Puritanism, the Semitic element in our Christianity has too much eclipsed the Hellenic element.

reverse. It is God who is unknown. It is His nature which is inscrutable. It is His ways which are 'past finding out.' It is His mind—towards us, and towards all His creatures—which is fearfully and perplexingly obscure. While in Christ,—who is 'very man' like ourselves,—that obscurity is cleared up, and that perplexity relieved. 'No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath *revealed* Him.' So that in Christ, the smiling face of God's tender love and compassion looks upon us. His purposes of mercy have become understood. The feelings of His heart (if we may so say) have made themselves intelligible. And this baffling universe—that looks, to the superficial eye, so like a dead and heartless machine—puts on, at once, a human and engaging aspect. Our confidence is restored. And we repose in faith on the conviction, that (in some transcendent sense) what we call 'Justice,' 'Truth,' and 'Love' shall ultimately prevail and shall find all enemies put under their feet.

And hence two thoughts suggest themselves, which may perhaps be worthy of a profounder study than is usually given to them in England. The *first* is, the question whether an undogmatic theology, which is afraid of and abandons metaphysics [67], can possibly be a sound or a 'Christian' theology? For Christ is acknowledged, on all hands, to be in *some* sense Divine. And to determine in *what* sense, is a problem which can only

[67] Few things are more amusing, than the almost supercilious pity with which the subtle Eastern theologians regarded the phenomenon of Western inability to handle Metaphysics. The distinction between *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις* was actually too much for them! *οὐ δυνάμενοι—διὰ στενότητα τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς γλώττης καὶ ὀνομάτων πενίαν,—διέλειν ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ὑπόστασιν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀντεισαγόυσης τὰ Προσώπα, ἵνα μὴ τρεῖς Οὐσίαι παραδεχθῶσι,—τί γίνεται; ὡς λιὰν γελοῖον,—ἢ ἐλέεινον.* (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xxi.)

be resolved by a metaphysical inquiry. The *second* is, the question how it has come to pass, that the Church's doctrine of the Holy Trinity has—in point of fact—satisfied so many generations of able and thoughtful men? Whether it be not a true account of the matter, to say that the adorable Object—when it is thus presented to the human Subject—*finds a singular correspondence and reflection there*[68]*?* For as the eye can only see that which it has some kindred capacity for seeing; so perhaps the complex Mind of man could only grasp a dim conception of the supreme Being (in whom all its highest ideals are realized), when that sublime conception is—like the man himself—One; and yet, in some mysterious way, Three[69].

And again, since the filial Emotion of reverent love can only well forth within the soul, when a sense of paternal similitude—in some ineffable manner and on some transcendent scale—is first established, hence it may be that the intelligent Father of all existence deigns to mirror Himself in man's *intelligence;* the Son, suspended (as it were) *πρὸ ὀμμάτων* in space 'to draw all men unto Him,' addresses Himself to our receptive *imagination*[70]*;* and the Spirit, working out His gracious

[68] 'Every step of real advance in the matter of Christology must be preceded by a deeper knowledge of the nature of God *and of man*.' (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, iii. 2: English translation.)

[69] *Ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλομένῳ ὁρᾶν, καὶ ὁρῶντι ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν. Διαφέρει δὲ οὐδὲν, εἴτε που ἔστι, εἴτε ἔσται.* (Plato, *Repub.* ix. sub fin.) 'Vellem ut hæc tria cogitarent homines *in seipsis:* esse, nosse, velle . . et utrùm propter tria hæc et *ibi* Trinitas, . . quis facilè cogitaverit?' (Aug. *Confess.* xiii. 11.)

[70] Observe how wonderfully, and (it is possible to doubt) purposely, the Incarnate SON,—with His brief but striking Ministry, His public death, and His hierarchy of surrounding apostles, saints, and martyrs,—lends Himself, as plastic material, to imaginative treatment. A well-known work on *Sacred and Legendary Art*, and on the pictoral *History of our Lord*, occupies no less than three large volumes. But I have never heard of any book, or seen any work of art, which was occupied (predominantly) with the æsthetic presentation of the

purposes as history unfolds itself, finds response in the active will and practical *conscience* of man, enters into combination with his mind, bears witness with his spirit, helps his infirmities, speaks in his unuttered prayers, and displays—to his love, rather than to his reason—the deep things of God.

But whatever these merely tentative speculations may be worth, one truth remains certain. And it should be clearly understood by every one, of every way of thinking, that the Catholic Church has always as emphatically taught this truth, as it was taught by our Lord and His Apostles[71]. It is this: that no man by mere *thinking* can ever attain to the knowledge of God. Thinking, at the utmost, only clears away barriers. The avenue to God is a *moral* avenue[72]. 'He that *wills* to do God's will shall know of the doctrine.' 'He that *loveth*, knoweth God: for God is Love.' And hence it is 'not to the wise and prudent, but to *babes*,' that God has mainly revealed Himself. And he that will be wise in this soul-redeeming wisdom, must first learn to think less of himself as a philosopher, must cultivate humility of mind, must (in short) 'become a fool that he may be wise.'

---

*other* Divine Persons.—We may remark too, how entirely devotional Art loses sight of mere *time*, and abandons all chronological proprieties. E.g. in Fra Angelico's beautiful picture of the Crucifixion, at Florence, no less than twenty saints are introduced; and their dates vary, from A.D. 26 (St. John the Baptist) to A.D. 1250 (St. Thomas Aquinas).

[71] Cf. the following passage, from a profound Greek theologian, in the eighth century: *ὥσπερ οὐ τῆς οὐσίας Αὐτοῦ μετέδωκεν ἡμῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ τῆς γνώσεως τῆς οὐσίας Αὐτοῦ. Ἀδύνατον γὰρ φύσιν τελείως γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερκειμένην φύσιν . . Δι' ἄφατον οὖν ἀγαθότητα, ηὐδόκησεν ἐκ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ὀνομάζεσθαι· ἵνα μὴ ἀμέτοχοι παντελῶς ὦμεν τῆς Αὐτοῦ ἐπιγνώσεως ἀλλ' ἔχωμεν κἂν ἀμυδρὰν Αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν.* (Johannes Damascenus, *De Fide Ortbod.* i. cap. 12.)

[72] 'This was the usurpation of the schools of Theology in former ages, —to issue their decrees to the subjects of the *senses* and the *intellect*. No wonder Reason and Faith were at variance. The other cause of disagreement takes place, when Reason is the aggressor and encroaches on the province of Religion, attempting to judge of those truths which

Thus have all the greatest saints and fathers of the Church with one accord expressed themselves. Ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον τὸ μάθημα, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem[73]. Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐγχείρημα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καθάρτεον ἑαυτὸν πρῶτον, εἶτα τῷ Καθάρῳ ὁμιλήτεον, says St. Gregory Nazianzen[74]. 'Trinitatem omnipotentem quis intelligit?' says St. Augustine. 'Rara anima quæ, cùm de illâ loquitur, scit quid loquitur[75].' And, with equal humility, it is always plainly acknowledged by them, that human philosophies can do no more than clear away obstructions, and keep away 'heresies'—notions, that is, that will not graft or assimilate with the Church's living tree of doctrine. All, says St. Clement of Alexandria, is but γνωρίζειν, οὐχ ὃ ἔστιν, ὃ δὲ μὴ ἔστιν[76]. 'Hujusmodi nomina,' says St. Ambrose [viz. 'substance,' 'person,' and the rest], 'sunt inducta in divinis ad *removendum*, non ad ponendum aliquid[77].' And even Aquinas, the subtle schoolman, in the heart of the middle ages, confesses: 'Ad inveniendum *nova nomina*, *antiquam fidem de Deo significantia*, coegit necessitas disputandi cum hæreticis[78].'

Yes: 'modern language, to express the ancient faith,' —there is the secret of the whole matter; there is the watchword of the Church's whole conflict, in her mani-

---

are subject to another part of our nature—the *moral sense*.' (Newman, *University Sermons*, p. 44.) 'A rational religion can have no existence unless it is founded upon *the laws of morality*.' (Kant, *Critik of Pure Reason*, p. 390.)

[73] Cyril Jer., *Cat. Lect.* xi. 3:—cf. *ibid.* 11. οὐ γὰρ τὸ 'πῶς ἐγέννησεν' εἰπεῖν καταγγελόμεθα· ἀλλὰ τὸ 'οὐκ οὕτως' διαβεβαιόμεθα.

[74] *Orat.* xxix. 1.

[75] Aug. *Confess.* xiii. 11.

[76] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 11.

[77] Ambrose, *De Fide*, § 51.

[78] Aquinas, *Summa*, i. 30. 3. 'These expressions were found out and used by the ancient Church, *to prevent the fraud* of those who corrupted the doctrine of the Person of Christ, and obscured their pernicious sentiments under ambiguous expressions.' (Owen, *Works*, xii. 283.)

fold controversies about the Holy Trinity[79]. It is not that she delights in this terrible deployment of verbal subtlety; or that her greatest men have ever taken pleasure in it. Rather they have shrunk from it. They have deplored the necessity, which drove them to the use of these fine-spun definitions. Athanasius habitually avoided using his own celebrated watchword, ὁμοούσιον[80]. Yet he too felt,—precisely as so many Churchmen feel now,—that a definite *creed* is like an anchor to ride freely by. He saw that it gives liberty of motion (as compared with other possible alternatives), amid our present storms; that it adds force to thinking; and enables us (if I may use his own word) to παρρησιάζεσθαι, —that is, to expatiate, to speak openly and with a sense of filial liberty about God. For 'nisi quietum, nihil beatum[81].' Τὸν δὲ ἀληθείας ἐραστήν τε ἅμα, καὶ γνώριμον, εἰρηνικὸν εἶναι—κἂν ταῖς ζητήσεσι—προσῆκεν[82]. 'Contendunt

[79] In theology—as in all other sciences—there is a *variable* and a *permanent* element. The part of wisdom and faithfulness is, not to refuse all change with a perpetual cry of 'non possumus,' but to bring home, by bold and skilful *adaptation*, old truths to new times. 'Si philosophia loqui posset (said Ernesti), haud dubiè se *popularem* profiteretur.' And a sound theology has always said the same. 'Language is worth, after all, just what it means to those who use it. . . The faith and aim of the Church was one and unchanging. But the question, whether a particular symbol would represent her mind with practical accuracy, received an answer at Antioch which would have been an error at Nicæa.' (Liddon, *Bamp. Lect.* p. 648.)—'It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, . . to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting, any variation.' (*Preface to Book of Com. Prayer.*)—'Μεσότητα' δὲ ὅταν εἴπω, 'ἀλήθειαν' λέγω. (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xxix. 2.)—'The Catholic historian distinguishes a permanent element and a changeable: the former being the *substance* of the faith itself; the latter the perception, comprehension, and *representation* of this firm substance of faith.' (Bp. Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, i. 233: Engl. trans.)

[80] 'One of the characteristic points in Athanasius is his constant attention to the *sense* of doctrine, or the *meaning* of writers, in preference to the words used. Thus he scarcely uses the symbol ὁμοούσιον throughout his Orations.' (Newman, *Note on Athan. Tracts*, i. p. 17.)

[81] Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum*, i. 20.

[82] Clem. Alex., *Strom.* viii. 1.

et dimicant: et nemo, *sine pace*, videt istam visionem[83].' And—as medical science plainly warns us—repose and balance of thought are absolutely indispensable to the health and vigour of the brain[84].

And lastly, one word on a practical question of great importance. It is this:—Have not we Churchmen much to learn from Unitarians? And if so, can we possibly be doing right, either to our Master or to them, in retaining our present repellent and hostile attitude towards them? In personal character many Unitarians represent the very highest type of Christian manhood. In ability and learning their ministers are often on a par with our own. To theology they not unfrequently make valuable contributions. In ecclesiastical matters, their tendency is rather towards the Church of England, than away from her. And on questions of Church and State, their opinion has hitherto been expressed rather in favour of that great guarantee of *intellectual freedom*, the National Establishment, than in sympathy with the Puritan attack upon it. If the severance should come (says one of their leading reviews), 'let it be accomplished, not only justly, but generously . . and with a patriotic regret that it should be needful. Let it be clear, that the National Church falls,—not by attacks from without (which it might easily have been strengthened to withstand),—but by internal weakness and dissension. . . *For much of what has been said of the*

[83] Augustine, *Confess.* xiii. 11.

[84] 'I cannot shut my eyes, as a medical man, to the mischievous consequences of such studies [the abstruse points of theology] to every brain whose delicate structure tends to insanity; nor to the advantage (medically speaking) of a system which puts such brains in *repose*. . . The soothing effect of ceremonial devotion is a moral medicine, calculated to produce a physical effect.' (Dr. Wigan, *on Insanity*, p. 428.)

*superior freedom which has been hitherto enjoyed within the Church is undeniably true*[85].'

Such writers as these, surely, are not very bitter enemies; and might easily be made friends. Such men, one would think, might without much difficulty be ranged in the Church's organized array of battle against ignorance, bigotry, and sin. We do not live (thank God) in the fourth century, and we ought not to copy its methods of controversy[86]. We live in an age of openness, candour, and courtesy towards opponents. And it may possibly be our highest wisdom, —while guarding more strictly the approach to holy orders[87], and rendering all discipline more effective by an increase of the Episcopate,—to throw open the outer precincts of the temple more generously and widely than we have ever yet done. And then, we may remember for our encouragement, that the old canon law of the Church was in nothing more imperative, than in prescribing that the doors of approach should be thrown open as widely and freely as possible. '*Episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi Ecclesiam, . . sive Gentilem, sive hæreticum, sive Judæum*[88].' And if the limit is there

---

[85] *Theological Review*, Jan. 1871, p. 94. Cf. Green, *Dissenters and the Church*, p. 15.

[86] The vehemence of religious controversy has been in all ages remarkable. It arises from the great facility with which *bigotry* is able to counterfeit *faith*. Both spring from the depths of our nature. Both move the man altogether (as the wind moves a cloud, or fear and pleasure move a child). But the one is of the earth,—selfish, violent, and tyrannical: the other is from heaven, —tranquil, peaceable, humble, tolerant. It is strange, therefore, that to many good men, the fourth century—in which every theological passion was fanned into a raging flame—should appear a sort of controversial *golden age*.

[87] Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ τοῦ λαοῦ τάχα ἂν καὶ συγγινώσκοιμεν τοῦτο [ignorance of theology], πάσχουσιν,—οὓς σώζει πολλάκις τὸ ἀβανάνιστον· διδασκάλῳ δὲ πῶς τοῦτο δώσομεν; ὃς καὶ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ἀγνοίας ἐπανορθοῖ, ἄν περ ᾖ μὴ ψευδώνυμος. (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xxi. § 4.)

[88] *Decretum Grat.* iii. 1. 67.

added, 'usque ad Missam Catechumenorum,' Aquinas (on the other hand) tells us that the old distinction between the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium* had been long done away, even in his time: and Cardinal Bona thinks that it had been done away so early as the seventh century[89].

No: the days of theological hatred are (let us hope) at least on the way to their setting. 'Among the wise' (says Boethius, from his very dungeon where Arian spite had thrust him), 'no place whatever is left for hatred. To hate the good, who would be so foolish? to hate the bad, is absolutely irrational[90].'

But if even towards Separatists and *opponents*, wisdom and charity thus plead for candour and for a mutual understanding, how much more loudly do they plead that a spirit of concord and peace should reign, among brethren of the same household and *members of the same Church!* Indeed we dare not hope that the former plea will ever be heard to any good effect, until the claims of the latter have been fully recognized. Charity begins at home. And if men cannot bring themselves to love their brother, whom they have seen, all exhortations to the practice of still loftier and more difficult virtues are likely to be in vain[91].

---

[89] 'Ut observat St. Thomas (*Suppl.* iii. 37. 2): "Nunc abiit in desuetudinem hic ritus: et a foribus Ecclesiæ discesserunt ostiarii, sublatisque repagulis omnes indiscriminatim ad ipsum altare irrumpunt." .. Quâ ætate id fieri cœpit, incertum est. Mihi haud improbabile videtur, Ecclesiæ fores cunctis introire volentibus tunc patuisse, cùm jam nulli erant "infideles," nulli catechumeni et penitentes, qui à synaxi arcerentur et peractâ concione dimitterentur. Id verò, in Ecclesiâ Latinâ, circa A.D. 700, contigisse.' (Card. Bona, *De Rebus Liturgicis*, lib. i. § 16.)

[90] Boethius, *De Consolatione*, iv. line 140 (ed. Peiper, 1871).

[91] The vast importance of this re-union *within* the Church of England—as the sole guarantee of her safety, and the first condition of her progress—is acknowledged by all parties. 'It is not from the bom-

Above all, these duties of candour and toleration seem to be, in an especial manner, incumbent on those who are called 'High Churchmen.' They are—in point of religious faith—those whom St. Paul would call *οἱ δυναροί.* They, of all mankind, can most safely bend to the intellectual needs of others. They are anchored securely, by their firm loyalty to tradition. And their faith would remain unhurt, were all that criticism has the remotest chance of reaching, already reached, and its material transformed into other shapes. To them, therefore, this plea for peace and candour, and for a fearless recognition of the services and claims of Reason, should surely come home with a special force and urgency [92]. And by them, above all men, the hearty reconciliation of those two great parties within the Church, that are certainly destined to share the future between them,—the *traditionary* and the *scientific* schools,—should be welcomed and laboured for, with a real enthusiasm and a courageous zeal for God.

For *γνῶσις* and *πίστις* are not really in antagonism. The one is but the flower and crown of the other. And it is not 'faith' which is the last word of our Christian

---

bardment of the *Liberation Society* on the outworks of the Church, but from the feuds in the garrison, that the citadel will be at length surrendered.' (*Baptist Magazine*, Mar. 1871, p. 172.) 'He could not support Mr. Miall's scheme . . for this reason: that he could not but acknowledge the enormous good being effected by the laity and clergy of the Church.' (Mr. Winterbotham, Speech reported in the *Liberator*, Feb. 1, 1871, p. 26.) 'I believe the position of the Establishment to be unassailable,—at any rate, for as long a period as we need look to,—provided only that those who belong to it can manage to keep the peace among themselves.' (Lord Derby, Speech reported in *Guardian*, Jan. 10, 1872.)

[92] 'Unless the doctrines received by Faith are *approvable* by Reason, they have no claim to be regarded as true. . . Like a spectator, it acknowledges and *concurs in* what goes on.' (Newman, *Univ. Sermons*, p. 174.)

hopes, but 'knowledge,'—to *know, even as we are known*[93]: and,—by the avenue of candour, purity and love,—to reach at last the happy goal, and to *see God as He is*[94].

---

[93] 1 *Cor.* xiii. 12. [94] *Matt.* v. 8; 1 *John* iii. 2.

# APPENDIX I.

## *The Metaphysical Language of the Church.*

'Metaphysics' is the science of the facts of consciousness. It is the science which—not content, like the other sciences, to take the presentments of the senses, &c. for granted as absolute truth — questions and examines into the truth of these presentments; inquires what precisely they mean, how far they are trustworthy, and what relation the subjective *presentments* on our cerebral mirror bear to the transcendent objective *realities* which make on us that impression. It is true we cannot get far beyond 'impressions.' We cannot stand outside of ourselves, nor reach (by the avenue of the intellect) absolute truth, where we can say it is impossible for things to be otherwise than they are. Such absolute certainties can only be reached by a moral avenue. When therefore the idea of God dawns upon the mirror of our consciousness,—unless we are simply to 'believe and tremble,' and with superstitious dread to refuse to look freely and intelligently on His revelation of Himself,—we seem at once invited to use Metaphysics. We are bound to ask the profoundest and subtlest questions that we *can* ask; sure, meantime, that our profoundest thoughts have no more fathomed the depths of His Being, than our puny telescopes have fathomed the star-sown depths of space.

Now the subtlest metaphysical philosophies within the ken of the ancient Church, were those of the great Hellenic thinkers,—especially of Plato and Aristotle. Accordingly, 'Theology' (properly so called) was all along a Greek science, dependent on Greek terminology. It is true the Hebrew words יהוה and מימרא were expressions of a metaphysical sort, and invited metaphysical treatment. But the Jewish mind was eminently unfitted for this branch of study: and the words remained (scientifically) unfruitful, till they were exposed to the stimulating brilliancy of Greek thought at Alexandria. And then they immediately took a marvellous speculative development, in the works of Philo Judæus and others.

Hence when Christ appeared, and (after a thousand acts and words of superhuman power and wisdom) spake those astonishing enigmas, 'No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son' (Matt. xi. 27): and 'Go ye, and baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost' (Matt. xxviii. 19):

the metaphysics of Alexandria were at once consecrated, to express and (in a certain degree) to clear the enigma, by irradiating the Messiah-doctrine of Palestine with the Λόγος-doctrine of the Hellenistic Schools.

And yet once more, as time went on and heresies necessitated 'nova nomina, antiquam fidem significantia,' the problem of a divine relation between the Father and the Son drew from Platonic metaphysics a subtle word *οὐσία*,—to express the colourless background (so to speak) of the Divine Nature, embracing the adorable Triad; and from Aristotle and the later philosophers the (originally equivalent) word *ὑπόστασις*,—which was then given a technical meaning and made to express the coloured and qualified *οὐσία* (if we may venture so to speak), held (not in common) by the 'Persons' mysteriously spoken of as ONE by our Lord. But the Latin Church,—unable to keep pace with these fine subtleties of Hellenic thought,—begged leave to substitute the coarser word *Πρόσωπον*, *Persona*, to express the same thing; a leave which was, somewhat superciliously, granted.

Ere long, there sprang up a new controversy, about the *means of grace*. And then, (the Baptismal Sacrament, in some way, escaping philosophical maltreatment,) the Eucharistic question enlisted in its service the Aristotelian metaphysics of the middle ages; till the Latin Church was satisfied to believe that,—the *οὐσία* of the bread being annihilated, and the *οὐσία* of the Lord's Body taking its place,—the *συμβεβηκότα* only, the 'accidentia,' of the bread remained, to beguile the senses and veil the wondrous transformation.

The subsequent controversies that have arisen,—about Inspiration, Regeneration, Infallibility,—though all capable of a metaphysical treatment, have not yet passed through that ordeal: though it were much to be desired that they should. But it were *only* to be desired, on one condition; viz. that the science itself should first come to a clearer conception of its own powers, its limits, and its objects; should acknowledge that a deeper study, under better methods, of—that 'grande profundum'—*human nature*, is its true avenue to deeper things still; and should recognize that fact, which alone gives significance and weight to the negations of the Unitarian; viz. that the German races (at least) are now adult, and that the watch-words of our modern theology should in future be, (1) the Holy *Spirit*, (2) the Catholic *Church*, (3) the Individual *Conscience*.

# LECTURE VII.

## THE WESLEYANS.

A.D. 1795.

*Leading idea*:—Revival of religion; by a free appeal to the 'feelings.'

*Method adopted*:—An elaborate system of 'societies;' preaching the doctrine of 'sensible conversion.'

Αἰσχρὰ, ἀγαπητοὶ, καὶ λίαν αἰσχρὰ, καὶ ἀνάξια τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀγωγῆς ἀκούεσθαι,—τὴν βεβαιοτάτην καὶ ἀρχαίαν Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίαν, δι' ἓν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα στασιάζειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους! . . Ἐξάρωμεν οὖν τοῦτο ἐν ταχεῖ· καὶ προσπέσωμεν τῷ Δεσπότῃ, καὶ κλαύσωμεν ἱκετεύοντες Αὐτὸν ὅπως, ἵλεως γενόμενος, ἐπικαταλλαγῇ ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν σεμνὴν τῆς φιλαδελφίας ἀγωγὴν ἀποκαταστήσῃ ἡμᾶς! (Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. § 47.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

*c.* 300. Pachomius, &c. First religious 'Societies' in Egypt.
340. Athanasius (from Egypt) visits Rome, with some monks.
500. Benedict adapts 'Monasticism' to the West.
*c.* 1000. Monastic reforms (Cluniacs, Cistercians, &c.)
*c.* 1200. New religious Societies (Mendicant Friars).
*c.* 1300. Religious 'Colleges' for study, at Oxford.
*c.* 1400. The Beghards, &c. on the Continent.
*c.* 1500. Monasteries converted into Cathedral bodies, or suppressed.
*c.* 1600. Many new Orders, mostly of a 'practical' kind.
1670. Spener's 'Collegia Pietatis' at Frankfort.
1726. John and Charles Wesley and George Whitfield form a 'Society' at Oxford.
1735. Wesley sails for America, with twenty-six Moravians.
1738. Returns home; and joins the 'Moravians' in London.
1739. Open-air preaching at Bristol: convulsions begin.
— First 'Meeting-house,' at Bristol.
1740. Wesley and Whitfield secede from the Moravians.
1741. Wesley separates from Whitfield and the Calvinists.
1744. First 'Conference.'
1763. Secession of Bell and Maxfield (enthusiasts).
1778. 'Arminian Magazine' begun.
1784. Wesley 'ordains' Dr. Coke, &c. for America.
— 'Deed of Declaration:' Conference legalized.
1791. John Wesley died.
— Insubordination among the preachers.

---

1795. 'Plan of pacification:' viz. by severance from the Church.
1797. Kilham's secession: 'Methodist New Connexion.'
1810. Secession of the 'Primitive Methodists.'
1813. Dr. Coke dies, on a mission to India.
1815. Secession of the 'Bible Christians.'
1828. Secession of the 'Protestant Methodists,' at Leeds.
1835. Dr. Warren: Secession of the 'Wesleyan Methodist Association.
1849. The 'fly-sheets:' Secession of the 'Wesleyan Methodist Reformers.
1868. Overtures, from Churchmen, for re-union.
1871. 'Class-meeting' dispute: Mr. Hughes degraded.

# LECTURE VII.

## THE WESLEYANS.

'Mind not high things: but condescend to men of low estate.'—*Rom.* xii. 16.

THERE is a petition in our Prayer-book, which many of us are in the habit of hearing or repeating every day of our lives; yet which we too often pass over, without throwing into it all the hearty fervour of concurrence which it deserves. It forms part of that 'Prayer for Clergy and People,' which has come down to us from the 'Sacramentary of Gelasius' in the fifth century; and has therefore been in use in the Western Church for at least fourteen hundred years. It embodies that noble thought of St. Augustine, that (after all) the *natural*, the normal, the ordinary doings of God, are the greatest and most admirable of His marvels[1]. It suggests —by one word, full of beauty and of meaning—the Lord's own claim to be the 'Physician' of souls. It directs us, in short, to pray that 'bishops, curates, and congregations' may be endued with 'the *healthful* spirit of His grace.'

[1] Augustine, *Epist.* cxx.; *Civ. Dei*, xxi. 8.

Yes: health, spiritual health and soundness, perfect sanity, wholesomeness, and tranquil half-unconscious balance of all the moral functions of the inner man,—what words can express the greatness of this blessing! What thanks can reach the height of this great 'marvel,' this restoration of fallen man, this healing of his diseased and troubled soul, this 'redemption' (in one short word) of his true self (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος), this revival of those Christ-like lineaments upon his nature, in likeness of which he was originally made! For it is easy to speculate about the manner in which the present human frame and average character may have been evolved from lower forms of life; and deeply interesting,—with all humility and fitting reserve,—thus to trace the hand of God in nature and to perceive that we are (as the Bible has expressly taught us) only the last links in His great chain of terrestrial creation[2]. But still Science has to confess, after all, what the Church has always taught; viz. that man seems capable of sinking again even below the level of the animal world; and that, by some fall or 'fault' or downthrow he has—in fact—reached depths of degradation, which place him far beneath his proper station, and out of line with that Divine ideal which (to use human language) floated before his Creator's mind[3].

Amid this 'fallen,' sinful, unhealthful world then, it was, that the Church of God was placed, as a treasury of all His *healing* graces, as an 'educating society' to disabuse mankind of its noxious illusions and super-

[2] *Gen.* i. 1–26.

[3] 'So long as the animal part of human life lacks the better half belonging to it, it sinks *below* the animal form of development, and becomes bestial. Nothing is easier and more agreeable to the unawakened, uncultivated side of human life, than to be bestial.' (Ackerman, *Das Christliche in Plato*, p. 194: English trans.)

stitions, as a vast *sanatorium* to restore them to perfect 'health and soundness' in the presence of each other and of God. But, in carrying out this truly divine and charitable task, the Church has in all ages been hindered, not merely by the grosser forms of vice and sin, but also by the perpetual recurrence of that subtle form of selfishness in spiritual things, which the Lord so unsparingly rebuked and condemned in the person of the 'Pharisees.' This word means simply *separatists;* men who stand apart from their brethren as being holier than they; men who presume to sever the wheat from the tares, the sheep from the goats, before He arrives who alone can do this truly. And for such spiritual pride there stands on the pages of Scripture the sternest and sharpest rebukes which ever—during His ministry on earth—proceeded from the mouth of Christ.

But there is yet another form of this same sin, another kind of self-withdrawal from the needs of the lowly and the ignorant, to which the officials of the Church herself —especially in prosperous and halcyon days gone by— have too frequently given way. And it is even far more disgraceful and inexcusable than Pharisaism itself. For if anything is Anti-christian in this modern world of ours, if anything is clean contrary to the 'mind which is in Christ Jesus[4],'—who, though being in the form of God and equal with God, stood not on His rights; did not, enjoyed not, what He *might* have done and enjoyed; but condescended to mankind, yea down to the very depths of a malefactor's agonizing death,—it surely is *the selfish and personal enjoyment of any privileged position* with which we have been put in trust. 'Privilege,' of any kind, so misunderstood and misused, is (as the

[4] *Phil.* ii. 5.

readers of classical antiquity know full well) the characteristic mark of society in a state of heathenism. Whereas Christ has bidden us,—if we would be true members of the realm of God, the 'Civitas Dei,'—to regard every privilege as simply an opportunity for good to *others*, every advantage as a *trust* imposed upon us, every possession as merely a *reservoir* of some common benefit, for whose righteous and unselfish distribution we shall one day have to give account.

What, then, must we say of those, who—set in places of advantage and privilege and honour, in His very Church itself—refuse to recognize their duties to the poor; neglect the ignorant and the sinful, for whose sakes they were given these advantages; forget to 'condescend to men of low estate;' and 'enjoy' their benefice or their accumulation of benefices—perhaps some thirty, forty, or fifty years—as though it were only a just reward of their merits, or a fitting opportunity of 'doing well unto themselves?' What else *can* we say, —but that such conduct, in the individual, is fatal to his own soul: and in the body politic—if it should ever reach such wide dimensions—is the symptom of a terrible disease, which is sure to reveal ere long (as disease always does) the existence of a new set of latent remedial laws. These laws are restorative if possible. But if not, then they effect the removal and destruction of what had become a source of wide-spread infection. 'Where the carcase is, thither the eagles are gathered together.'

And, unwelcome as is the task of pointing out the faults and omissions of our mother Church, I fear it is impossible to deny, that in the early part of the eighteenth century—amid the general coldness, languor, and want of enthusiasm which characterized that effete

epoch—the Church of England, as well as all the Dissenting bodies, slumbered and slept[5]. A dry rationalism had taken possession of her. And all the powers of her ablest men were employed in intellectual contests with Deism and Unitarianism; while an equally dry morality and stoical praise of 'Virtue' formed the staple of her exhortations from the pulpit. At the same time a shameful system of 'pluralities' had grown up; whereby the best endowed and most privileged posts of labour became mere vantage-grounds for individual enjoyment and advantage; and the sin of πλεονεξία,—of covetousness, of grasping at more than is meet, both of pleasure and profit,—threatened to destroy the very life of the Church.

Under such circumstances, no one who believes in the divine origin and government of the Church, can feel much surprise if sharp remedial measures began soon to be applied. The Holy Spirit has never (as our Lord promised He should not) wholly abandoned His Church. And accordingly, that new set of laws before mentioned,—which we may call 'the laws of disease,'—now began to work, and threw out *symptoms*, such as ignorant and unskilful men always think are themselves the disease; but which men of sense know at once to be but Nature's signals of distress, demanding aid in her spontaneous efforts at self-recovery. And

[5] At this epoch, 'the Puritans were buried, and the Methodists were not born. The Bishop of Lichfield, in 1724, in a sermon said, "The Lord's Day is now the Devil's market-day" . . And the three Dissenting bodies were lamenting that numbers of their ministers were immoral, negligent, and insufficient.' (Tyerman, *Life of Wesley*, i. 61.) In Lichfield Cathedral Library is a copy of Dr. Balguy's *Sermons* (†1748), containing on the fly-leaf an autograph remark by Bishop Blomfield, —'No Christianity here.' See also Warburton's *Literary Remains*, p. 293, where a sad picture of the times is given in a *Sermon preached before the Princess*, 1756.

would that men of skill and sense could, at such crises, always be found at the head of affairs!

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, however, it is much to be lamented, that it was not so. The bishops and leaders of the Church were then too often chosen for merely political and party reasons. And ecclesiastical questions were made—as they have often been made, both before and since—mere banners for this world's conflicts, mere coverts of democratic and aristocratic strife. Hence the leaders and rulers of the Church were too often appointed in a way which brought positive disaster, instead of any benefit, to the community. Had John Wesley been appointed a bishop in the middle of the eighteenth century, (a thing quite impossible to conceive then,—though, thank God, quite possible now,) who can say how different might have been the fortunes of the English Church, and of her American and colonial daughters, through all succeeding times!

For it is around the name of John Wesley that our thoughts and memories involuntarily cluster, whenever our attention is drawn to the great Evangelical revival of that century. There is a law of the imagination, forcing it to demand a concrete and personal centre, round which (as flint gathers round some organic substance in the chalk) its floating historical conceptions shall dispose themselves. And the most natural centre to fix upon is (of course) some popular and well-known name—an Alexander, a Cromwell, a Napoleon—to bear, as that centre, the whole burden of good and evil deeds connected with the historical events in question. Indeed we seem at the present moment to be threatened with the growth of a 'Wesleyan Legend;' and John Wesley is credited with both an originality of invention and a completeness of plan, which did not in reality belong

to him[6]. Still, he was (without doubt) the greatest religious reformer of the eighteenth century. And though we cannot exclaim, with his latest exulting biographer, 'Methodism is the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ[7],'—we are able to allow that it is, at least, the greatest fact in the religious history of the eighteenth century; and that it justly deserves a patient and scrutinizing study. And we are sure that nothing but good can arise from a friendly and candid effort to ascertain its true relations, and to point out the true lesson that it teaches, to the mother Church of England.

It is indeed with the greatest possible reluctance, that any Churchman can bring himself to speak of the Wesleyan body as if its secession were complete. Even yet, it is believed, there are many thousands (and those among the best of 'the people called Methodists') who refuse to lift up their hand against the Church of England, or to be borne away by that rushing stream of Puritan hostility which is bent on doing her a mischief[8]. Even yet, secession can hardly be said to be

---

[6] Seven biographies of John Wesley have already been written: and the subject seems far from being exhausted even yet. As usual in such cases, it is the earlier publications which take the more sober view of his character and history; while those of a later date surround their hero with a halo of extravagant admiration. Alexander Knox, a personal friend of Wesley's, thus writes of him: 'How was he competent to form a religious polity so compact, effective, and permanent? I can only express my firm conviction that he was totally incapable of *preconceiving* such a scheme .. That he had uncommon acuteness in fitting expedients to conjunctures, is most certain: this, in fact, was his great talent.' (*Letter*, appended to Southey, ii. 428: third ed.)

[7] Tyerman, *Life of Wesley*, i. 12.

[8] Half a century ago, a distinguished Wesleyan could write as follows: 'Though Methodism stands now in a different relation to the Establishment than in the days of Mr. Wesley, *dissent* has never been professed by the body,—and for obvious reasons. (1) A separation of a part of the society from the Church has not arisen from the principles assumed by the professed Dissenters, and usually made so prominent in their discussions on the subject of

accomplished, — when so many Wesleyans habitually avail themselves of the ministrations of the Church; when so many cordially welcome the visits of her clergy; and when, amid all confusions and party-cries, there are still so many indications abroad that the Methodist societies have never forgotten, and will never be able to forget, their venerable founder's almost dying words: 'I live and die a member of the Church of England; and none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it[9].' The fact is (as one of their own most intelligent writers affirms), that 'there was no intention in Wesley's mind of a separation from the Church; nor was it even . . foreseen as a consequence. A necessary consequence it certainly was not[10].' No: John Wesley's purpose was not secession. It was simply—if we may believe his own words—that of *a revival of Religion, within the Church of England*[11].

But how should he proceed, in bringing this great and worthy purpose to its accomplishment? He, naturally enough, began by seeking amid the surrounding circumstances at that time some *means*, which could

---

Establishments: (2) a considerable number of our members actually continue in the communion of the Church of England to this day: (3) to leave that communion is not, in any sense, a condition of membership with us.' (R. Watson, *Observations*, p. 156.) 'Dissent has never been formally professed by the body.' (Id. *Life of Wesley*, p. 358.)

[9] *Arminian Magazine*, April 1790.

[10] R. Watson, *Observations*, p. 152, (ap. Southey, ed. Bohn.)

[11] 'What may we reasonably believe to be God's design in raising up the preachers called Methodists? Not to form any new sect; but to reform the nation, particularly the Church; and to spread Scriptural holiness over the land.' (*Large Minutes* of Conference, 1744–89, Qu. 3.) 'We are not seceders; nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles.' (*Ibid.* Qu. 45.) 'Wesley had now proposed to himself a clear and determinate object . . He hoped to give a new impulse to the Church of England, to awaken its dormant zeal, infuse life into a body where nothing but life was wanting, and lead the way to the performance of duties which . . the Church had scandalously neglected.' (Southey, *Life of Wesley*, p. 183, ed. Bohn.)

be either used or adapted to effect the object in view. And he found ready to his hand an idea, which had been broached half a century earlier by Spener, the great leader of the Pietist revival in Germany[12]. This was nothing else than the fruitful idea of *Ecclesiolæ* within the *Ecclesia;* of 'Collegia pietatis,'—as he called them; of confraternities, leavening nuclei, RELIGIOUS 'SOCIETIES' (in short),—governed by certain rules, walking orderly and methodically under their appointed leaders, and encouraged from time to time by visits from their founder, or from lay 'exhorters' sent by him in his stead. His first plan was, to commit his converts to the care and guidance of the parochial clergy[13]. And it was not till many of them proved unwilling or unable to fulfil this duty, that Wesley completed his system without them.

So far then was Mr. Wesley's 'Society' from being anything new or astonishing at that period, that (on

---

[12] This idea was first broached by Spener, in his work entitled *Pia Desideria*, (1675), p. 58 [ed. Feldner]: 'Es wäre vielleicht auch nicht undienlich, wenn wir wieder die alte Apostolische Art der Kirchenversammlungen in den Gang brächten; da, neben unsern gewöhnlichen Predigten, auch andere Versammlungen gehalten wurden, wo nicht *einer* allein aufträte zu lehren . . sondern auch andere, die mit Gaben und Erkenntniss begnadigt sind.'

[13] 'In the early stages of his career, Mr. Wesley was content to leave the good done by his ministry [precisely as our Church of England Mission priests now leave their converts], to the care of the clergyman of the parish.' (R. Watson, *Observ.*, ap. Southey, p. 183: Bohn.) But the following letter, addressed by him to a clergyman—well disposed towards him and his work—in 1757, displays the growth of an autocratic and mutinous spirit. Mr. Walker, of Truro. had asked the question: 'If you love the Church, why do you not give up your people to those in the Church, whom you yourself believe to be real ministers of Christ?' The answer was: 'Does Mr. Conon or you think, that the King and Parliament [!] have a right to *prescribe* for me, what pastor I shall use? . . If he be sent of God, can I receive him with a clear conscience, *till I know he is?* And even when I do, if I believe my former pastor is more *profitable* to my soul, can I leave him without sin?' (Coke and Moore, *Life of Wesley* [1792], p. 313.)

the contrary) London seems early in the eighteenth century to have positively *teemed* with such religious societies[14]. Some of them had been devised for a special practical purpose (like the still surviving *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, or the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*,—or the *Pure Literature Society*, instituted in our own day); and some again, had arisen for mere personal and private purposes of mutual edification. No less than forty of such societies are known to have existed at that time. Thus in 1698 (five years before Wesley was born), his father, a learned Lincolnshire rector, published a sermon 'preached before the *Society for the Reformation of Manners*.' There was another *Society for the Suppression of Vice:* and Wesley's own Journal in 1738 mentions *Mr. Fox's Society*, and a *Society in Aldersgate Street*, and several more. All these 'societies' required, before admission, 'a testimony of the candidate's sense of spiritual things and of his sincere intention to lead a religious life[15].' And the first trace of them in the Church of England reaches back so far as 1677; when Dr. Horneck, Bishop Beveridge and others,—having converted, from the dissolute and frivolous ways of the Restoration period, a great number of young men who applied to them for religious counsel,—advised a weekly meeting for mutual edification, and for combination in some special work of practical beneficence[16].

---

[14] R. Watson, *Life of Wesley*, p. 73.

[15] Tyerman, *Life of Wesley*, i. 217.

[16] Cf. Woodward, *Account of the Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in London*, p. 75 (written in 1699,—four years before Wesley was born). 'It was, however, only in *organization* that the two things were alike. The *spirit* of the older Societies was the very spirit from which Methodism was a reaction. . . They were not afraid to speak of the

But in point of fact, it is not to the æra of Spener or of Beveridge that we must look for the origin of this method of re-enkindling the Church's life, by a concentration of her smouldering embers for mutual help and closer contact. For what else, than this very purpose, lay at the root of that magnificent idea of the middle ages—THE MONASTIC SYSTEM? The working of that system is thus described by an enthusiastic Frenchman,—in words which a Wesleyan (I conceive) would apply to his own societies, without the alteration of a letter: 'They were an assembly of persons, whom God's grace had united, to live under the banner of the Cross, and to follow Jesus Christ crucified. They composed that inner and spiritual kingdom, which is not of this world, and wherein God reigns by His grace[17].' And again, a hundred years later, another admirer of the 'religious' life writes thus: 'To *discipline* the soul, to transform it by chastity, by obedience, by sacrifice and humility; to recreate the man wasted by sin into such virtue, that the prodigies of evangelical *perfection* have become, during long centuries, the daily history of the Church,—it is in this we see the design of the monks... During ten centuries, the secular clergy—naturally too much exposed to the influence of the world—have almost always been surpassed in devotion, in sanctity, and in courage, by the regulars withdrawn within their monasteries (as within citadels), where they have regained peace and strength in re-baptizing themselves

support of a good conscience, or of the everlasting rewards which were worthy of all the care and toil to be spent in the pursuit of them.' (Wedgwood, *John Wesley*, p. 154.) In 1739, Wesley 'began expounding the Bible to one of that network of Societies which,—like ditches dug to irrigate the soil,—were everywhere ready for the influx of enthusiasm, which Wesley was to pour into them.' (*Ibid.* p. 195.)

[17] *Ordres Monastiques* (Berlin, 1751): vol. i. p. 4.

in austerity, discipline, and silence[18].' And so John and Charles Wesley describe their UNITED SOCIETY, as 'a company of men having the form, and seeking the power of godliness; united, in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their own salvation... It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, (1) by avoiding evil in every kind; (2) by doing good of every possible sort, and as far as possible to all men; .. (3) by attending on all the ordinances of God,—such are, the public worship of God, the Supper of the Lord, fasting or abstinence... These are the general rules of our societies[19].'

We may, therefore, I think, safely affirm—little as the modern Wesleyans recognize it—that the Methodist societies are nothing more or less than that very well known phenomenon in the history of the Church, *the rise of a new religious order within her pale:* though subject, of course, in the eighteenth century, to all the new conditions, and liable to all the untried dangers, of our modern free self-governing European life. Accordingly, John Wesley (as has been often remarked) bears in every lineament of his character the likeness of one of the great founders and legislators of such orders. And his great and blessed work of religious revival was accompanied by precisely the same extravagances, and threatened by precisely the same distempers, as every student of Church history knows to have accompanied theirs. It caught,—as theirs almost always

[18] Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, i. pp. 12, 18 (Engl. trans.)

[19] *Rules of the Society*, 1743 (ap. Warren's *Digest of the Laws of Methodism*, p. 156).

did,—the infectious disease of fanaticism and hysteria[20]. It appealed too exclusively and unmercifully to the feelings; worked too much by the springs of terror; produced, amid these morbid conditions, a plentiful crop of visions, extasies, and revelations; succumbed to the temptation of over-government; and fell a victim to the heartburnings, jealousies, and secessions which always accompany that fault. Existing, however, amid the purer and freer atmosphere of modern England, it has been saved from the two mistakes (1) of imposing permanent *vows* upon its members; and (2) from laying undue stress upon a merely ascetic *celibacy*, which offers, —to ordinary men, and under ordinary circumstances,— an easier, less complex, less useful, and therefore a lower grade of the religious life. And in so doing, it has imitated the sound sense which,—from age to age all through the history of the Church,—has actuated good and holy men to reform the monastic system of their times, and to readapt it to the altered circumstances of the hour.

Before, therefore, we can quite accede to the triumphant boast, that 'Methodism is the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ,'—because it has in this country 931,000 'adherents,' and in other parts of the world 2,000,000 more[21],—we must pause a moment. We must reflect (if we are called upon to judge) what

[20] 'Cassian [A.D. 400], from his own experience, describes the listlessness to which a monk was exposed. . . They were sometimes relieved by madness or death. . . The imagination, and even the senses, were deceived by the illusions of distempered fanaticism.' (Gibbon, *Decline, &c.* chap. 37. Cf. also Kingsley, *Hypatia*, p. 14.)

[21] These statistical estimates are 'open to the objection that many of the enrolled members are children, who may not remain in the Society. The *adherents* (not members), in fact, include dependents, who go with their employers, &c. . . The American and colonial statistics are especially unreliable.' (Urlin, *John Wesley's Place in Church History*, p. 263.)

have been the comparative results of the great *Benedictine movement* of the sixth century, which islanded, amid the rushing inundation of Pagan and Arian barbarism, the relics of ancient piety, literature, and art, and then with free hand distributed them broadcast, to form the charters of our modern civilization. Again, we must ask, what were the results of the great *Preaching revival* of the thirteenth century; a revival which scattered lay evangelists[22] by tens of thousands over the face of Europe; at first humbly submitting to the guidance of the clergy; but soon rebelling against them, and claiming to supersede them and take their endowments from them[23]. Or again, we must inquire what sort of results were attained by those memorable '*Reformers before the Reformation*,' the Beghards, Lollards, and many similar confraternities; to whose previous labours the success of the Reformation is certainly due. Nor must we forget the fact (as people who dwell habitually in a narrow circle are apt to do) that similar ideas are actually at work, on an immense scale, though

[22] 'Whether the clergy liked the change or not, a body of *laymen* (for it must be remembered the friars were to all intents and purposes laymen, bound by certain religious vows,) had come forward to the help of the Church, to carry out those functions which the clergy could not, and visit those whom the clergy found it impossible to visit. A less formal, but not less effective, style of preaching prevailed.' (Brewer, *Monum. Francisc.* p. xxv.)

[23] 'And yf I had as muche wysedome as Salomon had, and shall happen to fynde the poor symplest prestis of this worlde [secular priests], I wolde not preche in ther parisshes wherein they dwelle, contrary to ther wille... And I wille not thynke that they be rechiles [reckless] and synfulle; for I considre and take them as my lordis and masters.' (*Testament of St. Francis* [Engl. trans. of 1400-1500]: ap. Brewer, *Monum. Francisc.* p. 563.) A century later, however, 'The Dominicans and Franciscans made it a gainful doctrine, to teach laymen that they were not bound to pay their tithes to their ministers... But against their detaining of parochial tithes, a canon was made in the General Council of Vienna, 1340; and their doctrine was taxed by Pope Innocent IV., about 1250.' (Selden, *On Tithes*, vii. § 4.)

under a different inspiration, all around us *at the present day;* and that since the Reformation innumerable fresh orders have sprung up (in France and elsewhere), of which we have no less than three hundred and thirty specimens in existence at this moment, upon our own English and Irish soil. Nay, must we not go a step even beyond all these revivals? Must we not inquire whether a still greater fact, by far, in the history of Christendom than any or all of these things, be not the stable, firm, and tranquil *Establishment of the Church* in these realms, for twelve hundred years and more? Whether its parochial network spread throughout the country, and its influence penetrating even to Christianize the military, legislative, punitive, and every other department of the State, be not facts of the very first consequence and interest; and whether the *existence* of the thing to be revived, be not of more importance than its subsequent *revival?*

But leaving all these curious historical comparisons,—let us now proceed to study the last of the many revivals which the Church of England has passed through previously to our own times; and which was unfortunately managed with so little skill, as to drift—unintelligently and unwillingly, like an ill-managed ship drifting on shore—into an all but complete separation and mutual estrangement.

(1) The mere history of Methodism, however, is so well known, that I need do little more here than call to mind the main facts and turning-points of the great revival; pointing out, if I can, the steps by which it has reached its present position. In June 1703, John Wesley was born: and in 1725, as a graduate of Oxford, he was ordained. In the following year he obtained a Fellowship at Lincoln College, which he retained for twenty-seven

years; and by which he was supported all through his laborious ministry of Evangelization till his marriage, in 1752. It was here then at Oxford, amid the streets and colleges that we know so well, that this great man was formed and moulded to be the instrument of good to untold thousands of his fellow-countrymen. And he himself was trained, and his enthusiasm enkindled here, mainly by the same agency which he afterwards used with such marvellous success for others,—viz. by the concentration of a few glowing hearts, which God's spirit had touched, into a *society* or confraternity. With his brother Charles at Christ Church, and their humbler companion Whitfield at Pembroke, and some twelve others, he determined to live under a common rule of strict and serious behaviour, to attend frequently at Holy Communion, and to use a methodical and conscientious arrangement of their time[24].

In short, the Wesleys were, in those days, very much what would now be called 'Ritualists.' They did not profess to invent new practices of devotion; but simply to revive what the Church already had. Nor did they, at first, refuse to seek counsel and encouragement from the bishops; or, thus far, seek it in vain. It was with the bishop's express concurrence that they visited the gaols; with the bishop's advice, John Wesley declined to bury himself in a rural parish[25]: shortly after-

[24] Hence no doubt arose the name *Methodists*,—for which other derivations have been found, more curious than true. Probably 'method' was a household-word at Epworth parsonage, and was frequently on the lips of the Wesleys at Oxford. 'The true founder of Methodism was Mrs. Wesley. The following letter to her son Samuel, in 1709 .. was no doubt paraphrased in many utterances to John and Charles .. "I would advise you, as much as possible, to throw your business into a certain *method*. Appoint so much time for sleep, eating, company, &c. In all things endeavour to act upon principle."' (Wedgwood, *John Wesley*, p. 48.)

[25] For this sound advice of Bishop Potter, all who love Wesley and

wards, Bishop Gibson of London gave the two brothers repeated interviews, and warned them against courting unnecessary persecutions: and Archbishop Potter of Canterbury gave them the important advice—which was in great measure the secret of their subsequent pastoral success,—viz. *Do not spend your time in controversy; but in attacking the strongholds of vice, and in promoting practical holiness.* Thus,—building on the previous good foundation laid by Horneck and Bishop Beveridge, and encouraged by the good-will and sound paternal advice of the existing bishops of the Church,—the Wesleys proceeded to carry on the work to which they seemed called. Its importance gradually dawned upon them. And at last it took clear shape, as the herculean task of reviving, amid the cold rationalizing atmosphere of the eighteenth century, a warm *love* of religion, an *enthusiasm* for the Church and her system, and a sustained spirit of prayer and of self-devotion to good works.

This then was the first period of Wesleyanism.

---

value his work ought to be for ever grateful. What had the world lost, and what might have been the state of England at the present day, if this advice had not been given, or had not been followed! For all reformers and revivers of religion, naturally, begin with a profound discontent. And the temptation always comes upon them, to retire from the world and seek—in selfish, un-Christlike διχοστασία—a nearer communion with God. This was the case with Benedict (A. D. 500): 'Horror of the vicious lives of those around him, together with the influence of religious enthusiasm, . . drove him into a hermitage at the boyish age of fifteen.' (Jameson, *Mon. Orders*, p. 8.) —with Columba (A.D. 650): 'It was the longing for solitude, the irresistible wish to find a more distant retreat, an asylum still farther off than that of Iona, upon some unknown rock amid the loneliness of the sea.' (Montalembert, *Monks of the West*, iii. 223.)—with Francis of Assisi: 'He retired into secret places, . . a cave or thicket, of which he had made an oratory.' (Oliphant, *Life of S. Francis*, p. 20.)—with Luther (A.D. 1505): 'Zu seiner Beruhigung, trat er in dem Augustiner-Eremiten Orden und dessen Kloster zu Erfurt.' (Schröck, *K. G. seit der Ref.*, i. 107.) —with George Fox (A.D. 1621), vid. suprà, p. 251:—and now, lastly, with Wesley. (Southey, *Life*, p. 28: Wedgwood, *Life*, p. 48.) In all such cases, it needs a voice from God (1) to speak, (2) to interpret the summons,—'Francis! seest thou not that My house is in ruins? Go and *restore* it for Me.'

It was cradled within the Church of England: it was fed by her sacraments: it was methodized by that very orderly religious life of hers, whose framework is laid down in the Prayer-book: it was encouraged and directed by her bishops: and it was given a home and a starting-place in her beautiful religious houses for study at Oxford, which were built and endowed by Churchmen of olden time, precisely for purposes of this kind. Wesleyanism may nowadays (if it can find the heart to do so) point the finger of scorn at the Mother-Church. It may even unite with her bitterest enemies in their grand assault. But it can never obliterate the fact,—which history will then inexorably record against it,—that it arose and was fostered within the Church of England: and that, not until its leaders *went astray into foreign pastures*,—importing from 'Moravians,' French 'Convulsionists,' and Calvinistic 'Puritans,' doctrines and methods of conversion, which the Church of England never will and never can sanction,—not until then were the pulpits and the buildings of their own Church closed against them, and the countenance of the English bishops withdrawn.

(2) This second and disastrous period of Wesleyanism opens with John Wesley's voyage to America in 1735. It was a mission nobly undertaken, at the instance of Dr. Burton, of Corpus College, and of the celebrated mystic, William Law. And its purpose was twofold: first, that of ministering to the settlers in Georgia, and then of evangelizing the neighbouring tribes of Red Indians[26]. But its results were far different from those which either Wesley, or those who wished him well, could have anticipated. For not only were his services

[26] Southey, *Life*, p. 47.

for the settlers rejected, and his mission to the Indians a failure[27], but on his voyage out, he had fallen in with twenty-six Moravian fellow-passengers, on their way from Germany to settle in Georgia: and they spoilt all. On his as yet unsettled, enthusiastic, self-dissatisfied frame of mind, the spectacle of their confident, tranquil, yet fervid piety, fell like a spark on tinder. 'From friends in England' (he writes in his journal, now first begun) 'I am awhile secluded: but God hath opened me a door into the whole Moravian Church[28].'

At that door he entered in, all too impulsively. And when, after three years' absence, he returned to England, abandoning virtually the tranquil, and (so-called) 'sacramental' system of his own Church,—i. e. the system of aiding by outward steps and ladders the ignorant and sinful to mount up towards spiritual things,—he became for some time a regular member of the Moravian Society in London. The unwholesome instructions of Peter Böhler, their leader, were eagerly drunk in. And Wesley learnt from them the fatal error (which he afterwards modified) that, not for *some* men, but for *all* men, there was a swift and royal road, by which the highest spiritual things could be reached at a bound[29]. He here learnt (in short) the

[27] He was opposed at Savannah, for his strict and literal obedience to the ritual and disciplinary canons of his Church. Even there, he attempted to revive religion by the same means which were afterwards employed with such success in England. 'As he did not find the door open for preaching to the Indians, . . it was agreed (1) to advise the more serious [colonists] to form themselves into a little *Society;* and to meet once or twice a week . . (2) to select out of them a smaller number, for a more intimate union with each other. Here we see the first rudiments of the future economy of *classes* and *bands.*' (R. Watson, *Life*, p. 38.)

[28] Southey, *Life*, p. 55.

[29] Peter Böhler taught thus: '(1) When a man has a living faith in Christ, then he is justified. (2) This living faith is *always given in a moment:* (3) and in that moment he has peace with God, (4) which he cannot have without knowing that he has it; (5) and being born of God he sinneth not: (6) and he cannot have this deliverance from

two peculiar lessons of subsequent Wesleyanism: viz. (1) instantaneous and sensible conversion: (2) the doctrine of perfection,—i. e. of a Christian maturity, or τελειότης, on attaining which, he that is (in the Wesleyan sense) 'born again,' 'born of God,' sinneth not.

It must be observed however, in passing, that these two doctrines are nothing more than exaggerated and ill-balanced statements of that which the Church of England has always taught. On her calendar of saints, stand the names of more than one, who have passed by a sudden transition from darkness to light, from heathenism to Christianity. And in her doctrine of 'sanctity,' she expressly invites all her children to climb up —by the angels' ladder of her sacraments and outward helps—to those calm heights of spiritual maturity, where (in Bishop Butler's words) 'their danger of actually deviating from right may be almost infinitely lessened[30].' Yet (as Hooker warns us) 'the strongest in faith that

sin, without knowing that he has it.' (Southey, *Life*, p. 113.) In flat opposition to this 'always,'—the logical issue of which is the Baptist, rather than the Wesleyan, system,—the Church teaches, and has ever taught, the sound and wholesome doctrine of *Baptismal Regeneration:* viz. that the symbolical admission within the family and brotherhood of Jesus Christ becomes realized, and takes effect, in every one, 'qui non ponit obicem:' that children, therefore, and immature people (νήπιοι, 1 Cor. iii. 1) are not rejected by our loving Master *until* they become mature, fully conscious, thoroughly awakened: but are tenderly cherished and educated by His Holy Spirit *within* the Church, and as 'Christians,' until at last (it may be) the blessing of 'assurance' and 'maturity' (τελειότης) is reached.—It was this which Wesley—rapidly recovering from the Moravianism, into which his followers seem to have relapsed—preached 'for above fifty years, never varying from the doctrine of the Church at all.' And as to his repeated warnings against trusting in any mere *symbolical* salvation from the state of sin and alienation, without any *real* renovation of character, —it is 'language which no High-Churchman shrinks from addressing to those who put Baptism in the place of holiness of life.' (*Wesley in company with High-Churchmen*, [Church Press Co.,] p. 6.) Read also Wesley's *Parents' Guide to Baptism* [ed. Holden, 1871], especially p. 11.

[30] Butler, *Analogy*, part i. chap. 5, (p. 77, Tegg's ed.)

liveth on the earth, hath always need to labour and strive and pray, that his *assurance* concerning heavenly and spiritual things may grow, increase, and be augmented [31].'

No such salutary warnings, however, are (in all human experience) listened to by men of enthusiastic feelings and religious asceticism, amid the first fervour of their discovery of a supposed new truth. This new truth seems to them, in their almost childish condition of delight, like a talisman, with which all the treasure-houses of God's grace are, with a word, to be opened. 'Lord, it is good for us to be here. This enthusiasm is delightful; and, under it, all things seemed bathed in the radiance of heaven itself. Let us take some measures, that it may abide permanently among us; and may not fade into the mere light of common day!' Such have been the phenomena of over-wrought religious feeling, from the earliest days of the Church down to the present moment. And under such impressions it was, that John Wesley first looked out for a similar 'sensible and instantaneous conversion' to happen to himself, and then organized a vast machinery for preaching it to others. But when a man under high mental excitement *looks out* for such a crisis of his inner being to occur, something that will answer to his high-wrought expectations is morally certain ere long to happen. And so, on Wednesday, May 24, 1738, about nine o'clock in the evening, at a 'Society's' meeting in Aldersgate Street, Wesley persuaded himself that he too had felt the desired transition [32], and had passed—*from what, to what?*

[31] Hooker, *Answer to Travers:* Works, ii. 679, (Oxford ed.)

[32] 'He was staggered, for a time, at the Moravian doctrine of an instantaneous change of heart. . . The indefatigable Böhler and his asso-

In the answer to that question, lies the whole doctrinal difference between modern Wesleyanism and the Church of England. I am not aware of any other cause of severance. But yet (so delicate a thing is theology!) in this one little point lies the germ of that lamentable estrangement which we all deplore; and which is parting asunder, every day more widely, hundreds of Christians, brothers in speech, sons of the same venerable Mother-Church, meaning almost (if not quite) the same thing, and using habitually the same formularies, the same hymns, the same Bible. And now, at last (it seems), there is actual danger of these 'brethren, sons of the same mother,' turning their arms against each other, in offensive—but (thank God), on *our* side, only defensive—war. May God, in His great mercy, spare us so miserable a spectacle!

But to return to the question: What was it, from which John Wesley,—and all those who under his influence have since gone through the same change,—were 'converted'? Was it, *from sin to God?* If so, I surely need not multiply quotations to show that,—suddenly or gradually, by some external stroke of God's providence, or by some internal awakening of His redeeming grace,—this great change is the very one, which all the

---

ciates had already been guiding Charles Wesley into the way of salvation... Three days after Charles had thus attained rest to his soul, John also found it... In the evening, he went very unwillingly to a Society in Aldersgate Street, where a layman was reading Luther's preface to the *Epistle to the Romans*. About a quarter before nine, while listening to Luther's description of the change which the Spirit works in the heart, through faith in Christ, "I *felt* (says Wesley) my heart strangely warmed. I *felt* I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and *an assurance was given me* that He had taken away my sins, even mine." Thus had the feet of both the brothers been directed into the path of life by the instrumentality of the London Moravians.' (Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, i. 101–105.) See also Southey, *Life*, p. 99.

great writers and preachers and pastors of our English Church have, for the last twelve hundred years, been persistently striving to produce upon those who have submitted themselves to her teaching. Or was it, *from half-consciousness and immaturity, to full consciousness* and an adult sense of filial 'assurance' and peace in believing? Surely again, I need not waste time in showing,—what every true son of the Church of England knows full well,—that this doctrine forms part of her regular system of teaching; that all her aids and stepping-stones and sacraments are meant to lead towards that goal; and (as Bishop Jeremy Taylor says) 'according as persons grow in grace, so they may grow in *confidence* of their present condition. . . And to those few, to whom God hath given confirmation in grace, He hath also given a certainty of their condition[33].'

No; alas! it was not merely these things that Wesley meant. It was not merely these sound and healthful truths of his own Church's creeds and catechisms, that he had now discovered under Peter Böhler's guidance. His temporary submission to a foreign and Moravian style of teaching,—which was quite alien from that of his own Church,—had heated his mind and thrown him into sad confusion. And so John Wesley,—the once loving and still (at heart) loyal son of the Church, the man who to his dying day 'held (to use his own words) all the doctrines of the Church of England, loved her liturgy, and approved her plan of discipline[34],'—that good man, disturbed with a transient fanaticism, could bring himself to stand up and say,

---

[33] Jer. Taylor, *Life of Christ*, pp. 539, 544.
[34] *Arminian Magazine*, 1790, p. 287.

'*till within the last five days I have never been a Christian.*'

'What!' replied his brother, Samuel Wesley, on hearing this,—'had he never then been in covenant with God? Was his baptism nothing? or had he apostatized from it?' Yes; even so: if, at least, we are to take his words seriously. The change—in his estimate—had been nothing less than a transition from heathenism to Christianity. His previous baptism into the family and household of Jesus Christ had been a mere formality, and an unmeaning superstition. The Puritan notion about these things was (after all) the true one. And —we must add—the present unhappy decadence of the Wesleyan 'revival' into a mere additional form of English 'Dissent,' becomes not only accounted for, but naturally and logically inevitable[35].

In point of fact, however, I believe it could be shown without much difficulty, that this foreign notion about the 'new birth' (which has been fixed upon and made so prominent since, as a banner of warfare against the Church) was merely a temporary phase of opinion, and never formed an essential or permanent ingredient in John Wesley's scheme of doctrine. For listen to his own subsequent words, taken from those very *Notes to the New Testament*, and those *volumes of Sermons*, which are the acknowledged tests of doctrine, subscribed to by all Wesleyan preachers at the present day. A man must 'experience that great inward change by

[35] 'He was met, at this point, with the objection that he was creating a schism. His answer to this, to himself at least, was conclusive. He acknowledged that, if by "schism" was meant only gathering people out of buildings called churches, he was creating a schism; but if it meant dividing Christians from Christians, it was not. For his converts *were not Christians*, before they joined the Societies.' (Skeats, *Free Churches*, p. 29.)

the Spirit, and be baptized . . as the outward *means* of it[36].' This was written in 1754—eighteen years after his Moravian 'conversion' to Christianity, and breathes a very different spirit indeed from that of Moravianism. A few years later still, we have the following expressions from his Sermons: 'By baptism we are admitted into the Church, and consequently made members of Christ . . from which spiritual vital union with Him proceeds the influence of His grace on those that are baptized. . . By water then, as a *means*, we are regenerated or "born again." . . And the terms, being "regenerated," or being "born again," or being "born of God," in Sacred Scripture always express an inward work of the Spirit, whereof baptism is the outward sign . . *and the outward sign duly received is always accompanied with the inward grace*[37].' Baptism 'is a precious *means*, whereby this faith and hope are given to those that diligently seek Him[38].' 'It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time *born again*. . . The whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend *how* this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years. But whatever be the case with infants, it is sure all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again[39].' And now, if we take into view his own persistent affirmation in still later times, 'I have uniformly gone on for fifty years, *never varying from the doctrine of the Church at all*,'—

[36] Wesley, *Notes* on S. John iii. 5.
[37] Wesley, *Works*, xix. 281.
[38] Wesley, *Serm.* 74: 'Of the Church.'
[39] *Ibid.* 45: 'On the New Birth.'

I think we cannot escape the inevitable conclusion, that the very doctrine on which his modern followers have built their separation from the Church and their alliance with Puritan Dissenters, is nothing else than a transient and *foreign* element in their great founder's teaching[40]. The longer he lived, the more resolutely he turned away from these Puritan errors. And therefore to construct on that basis a great practical system, which evaporates away into mere bald spiritualism the grand conception of an organized and visible Church, and exchanges the hope of a Catholic re-union of all Christendom, for the visionary dream of an 'Evangelical Alliance,' is simply to haul down the true colours of the Wesleyan revival and to surrender at discretion to Puritan dictation.

For this is, in one word, the question between Catholicity and Puritanism. Is the outward organized Church, —with its visible mechanism, its regularly-commissioned officers, its code of laws (ritual, disciplinary, and doctrinal), and its exterior means of grace—nought? or is it, on the contrary, the special organ of the Holy Ghost, the vehicle and instrument and 'sacrament' (as it were) of His inward operations, in renewing and redeeming mankind? In this question lies the whole controversy between the Church of England and 'Dissent.' And the controversy is gathered into a point on the (at first sight) irrelevant doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

For if a convulsive crisis in a man's inner being first

---

[40] 'In his old age, he said to Mr. Melville Home these memorable words: "When, fifty years ago, my brother Charles and I, in the simplicity of our hearts, told the good people of England, that unless they *knew* their sins were forgiven, they were under the wrath and curse of God, I marvel they did not stone us! The Methodists, I hope, know better now."' (Southey, *Life*, p. 177.)

*makes* him (as is too often affirmed) a 'Christian,' —then the Church of Christ, no doubt, ought to be composed of such 'converted' persons alone. It consequently becomes a purely *spiritual* society. It is an unorganized, invisible, and abstract thing. It has (as the earliest heretics affirmed concerning our Lord) no true body at all. It is all spirit. HOOKER is absolutely wrong,—who dares to teach, 'If by external profession men be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ, . . yea, though they be idolaters, heretics, persons excommunicable[41].' JOHN WESLEY is absolutely wrong,—who writes, 'By baptism we are admitted into the Church; and consequently made members of Christ, its Head. . . They are mystically united to Christ, and made one with Him. . . From which spiritual, vital union with Him, proceeds the influence of His grace on those that are baptized,—as from our union with the Church, a share in all its privileges and in all the promises Christ has made to it[42].' ST. PAUL is wrong,—who simply reminds immoral persons at Rome (exactly as a Churchman would do now) that they had already been by baptism engrafted into Christ's family, but were living unworthily of Him. The whole NEW TESTAMENT is wrong,—which, from beginning to end, *never once* calls upon a baptized person to become 'regenerate' (as modern Wesleyans do); but only bids them to become 'renewed[43].' Nay, what shall we dare to say of OUR LORD'S own words,—who so repeatedly represents His Church as a visible institution, with a visible means of entry, and as containing (till He comes to sift them)

---

[41] Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, iii. 1. 7.

[42] Wesley, *Parents' Guide to Baptism*, p. 11.

[43] Cf. *Rom.* vi. 1–14; xii. 2; 1 *Cor.* vi. 11; *Eph.* iv. 23; *Col.* iii. 10; *Tit.* iii. 5.

tares and wheat, bad fish and good, righteous and unrighteous alike[44]?

But now, a still stranger event occurred in John Wesley's life, which contributed still farther to darken and confuse his teaching, just at this critical period of his career. He had been carried away (it seems) by his love for the Moravians, so far as to take a long journey, and to visit the head-quarters of their communion at Herrnhutt in Saxony. There he had been an honoured guest, at the retreat which the enthusiast Count Zinzendorf had carved out of his estate, for these hunted Bohemian followers of Huss and Wicliffe. But he had returned home, after a brief residence among them,—as Luther returned from Rome,—not a little shaken in his allegiance to their system. Indeed shortly afterwards he broke from them entirely; set up a sort of English Moravianism of his own; and organized it with 'bands' and 'class-meetings' on their model[45]. The fact is that his feelings as a Churchman revolted against their ultrà-spiritualism; repudiated their doctrine that sacraments and outward means were nought; and protested that a man must do something more than wait, in quietude, until the influx of God's Spirit came upon him, and filled, like a rising tide, all the sluices and channels of his soul[46]. Besides all this too, it must

---

[44] Vid. *suprà*, p. 14.

[45] 'Methodism owes to Moravianism special obligations. (1) It introduced Wesley into that regenerated spiritual life, the supremacy of which over all ecclesiasticism and dogmatism it was the appointed mission of Methodism to reassert. (2) Wesley derived from it some of his clearest theological ideas. . . (3) Zinzendorf's communities were based upon Spener's plan of reforming the Established Churches by forming "little churches" within them. ... (4) In many details of his discipline we can trace the influence of Moravianism.' (Stevens, *Hist. of Meth.* i. 108.)

[46] 'I found every day the dreadful effects of our brethren's reasoning and disputing with each other. . . One came to me by whom I used to profit much; but her conversation was

not be dissembled that the instincts of command, which were prompting him to become the leader and founder of a new order in the Church, were already in full revolt against the calm assumption of superiority and the irritating attitude of direction which Count Zinzendorf and the Moravian preachers thought fit to assume.

But no sooner had this unquiet soul emancipated itself from one foreign influence, than it was warped out of its true course by another. *German mysticism* had done its work on him: and its doctrine of regeneration into God's kingdom by an interior convulsion of the mind, had left its mark upon Wesleyanism for all future time. But just as this extravagance seemed likely to subside and to be absorbed amid the healthier atmosphere of an English Churchman's common-sense,—most unhappily a strong breath of *French fanaticism* suddenly set across his path, from quite another quarter. And the singular phenomenon now presented itself, of an epidemic religious-hysteria commingling with, and emphasizing into lamentable extravagance, all the most dangerous features of the Methodist-Moravian doctrine about the 'new birth.' So wonderfully is all the world

---

now too high for me. It was far above, out of my sight. My soul is sick of this *sublime* divinity.' (Wesley, *Journal*, ap. Southey, p. 211.) 'Wesley took [a favourite volume among the Moravianized members] to Fetter Lane, and read these words before the jarring Society: "The Scriptures are good; prayer is good; communicating is good; relieving our neighbour is good: but to one who is not born of God none of these things are good, but all very evil. . . First let him be born of God. Till then let him not do any of these things. For if he does he destroys himself." Having twice read these words distinctly, . . he asked, "My brethren, is this right or is it wrong?" One of them replied, "It is right; it is all right." . . Another said, "I used the ordinances twenty years, yet I found not Christ. But I left them off only for a few weeks, and I found Him then."' (Southey, *Life*, p. 213.) On the following Sunday, Wesley (with about seventy followers) seceded from this Moravianized Society in Fetter Lane; and withdrew to the Foundry.

connected together! So impossible it is for any country, however isolated, or for any sect or church, however exclusive, to exclude—not merely the great tidal wave of the average opinion of their time—but even the smaller waves, that—generated in some far-off storm—plash and curl in our most sheltered harbours, and rock the tiny craft that have never once dared the open sea at all.

These French 'convulsionists'—who had, just before this time, brought their curious mental malady with them into England—were refugees from the atrocious *dragonnades* of Louis XIV.[47] Maddened by his abominable and relentless persecutions, deprived by his autocratic edicts of all that life held dear, robbed of their children at the sweet age of seven years old, broken on the wheel, hunted among the mountains of the Cevennes, beggared, insulted, tortured, massacred,—what wonder that these poor Protestants lost the balance of their mental powers, and engendered a hysterical disease[48]! The disease is (I believe), under its strangely

[47] 'Such, in fact, were the causes of the extasies or irregular inspirations: the want of spiritual guides and schools, spoliation, suffering, liability to torture, and constant apprehension of the galleys or the gibbet. The minds of these unfortunate creatures became excited. . . This religious enthusiasm began in Vivarais with the dragonnades and the Revocation,' [about A.D. 1686]. (Felice, *Protestants of France*, p. 98: Engl. trans.)

[48] 'Comprimé dans le Vivarais et le Dauphiné, l'illuminisme apparaît bientôt dans les Cévennes. Il y est apporté vers 1700. . . Voici, en général, en quoi consistait la crise ou l'accès d'illuminisme extatique, chez ces trembleurs des Cévennes: l'individu . . tombait subitement à la renverse, privé de sentiment. Étendu de tout son long sur le sol, il était saisi d'un accès épileptiforme, . . ses membres étaient agités de *convulsions*, il éprouvait des ressauts et des tresaillements désordonnés. Les personnes présentes se hâtaient alors de prodiguer leurs secours au malheureux ainsi *visité par l'Esprit*. . . En effet, la scène changait peu à peu. Les agitations convulsives diminuaient et finissaient par disparaître; le calme et la sérénité faisaient place au frissons et à la douleur.' (Figuier, *Hist. du Merveilleux*, i. 398.) 'A practical proof of the morbific power of the emotions and passions is found in

mutable forms, well known to medical science; though science has never yet been able to probe all its mysterious depths[49]. Its seat is, apparently, the great nervous ganglia of nutrition, which lie in the centre of the body; and whose strange sympathetic action with and upon the brain, has led to all the popular notions about the heart and neighbouring organs being the seat of various impassioned feelings.

Suffice it however, at present, to observe, that while the phenomena which this extraordinary and infectious disease presented, had sufficed to cheer the faith and animate the ardour of the Calvinists in the Cevennes against Rome; the very same disease not long after broke out among the Romanists themselves at Port-Royal[50]. Nay, already in the previous century, it had thrown whole nunneries near Bordeaux into wild confusion[51]. In the sixteenth century it had been known

the frequent occurrence of *psychopathitis* in times when all the elements of social life are in a state of fermentation. In and after revolutions, sudden changes of fortune, &c. produce a thousand cases of mental disorder.' (Feuchtersleben, *Medical Psychology*, p. 264, Sydenham edit.)

[49] '*Hysteria*,—that proteiform and mutable disorder, in which the imaginations, the superstitions, and the follies of all ages have been reflected.' (Hecker, *Epidemics*, p. 117, Engl. trans.) 'Wir wissen noch lange nicht hinlänglich was für ausserordentiche Dinge durch die Imagination, in Verbindung mit Sympathie und geheimen magnetischen Kräften, bewirkt werden können. Auch ist hieraus klar, dass wir unsere Natur . . noch nicht kennen; und aus diesem Grund auch nicht zu bestimmen vermögen, weder welcher geistigen Erhebungen, noch welcher geistigen Zerrüttungen, dieselbe fähig sei.' (Horst, *Deuteroskopie*, ii. 213.)

[50] 'Deux cents docteurs de Sorbonne furent exilés par lettres de cachet en 1729. Jamais la persecution ne s'était montrée si ardente. . . C'est alors que les convulsions éclatèrent. . . Le sol du cimitière de Saint-Medard et des rues voisines est disputé par une multitude de filles, de femmes, d'infirmes, d'individus de toutâge,—qui convulsionnent comme à l'envi les uns des autres. Des hommes se debattent sur la terre, en véritables épileptiques. . . Enfin, plusieurs convulsionnaires tombaient dans un état d'extase si complet, qu'on l'appelait l'*état de mort*.' (Figuier, *Hist. de Merv.* i. 350, 410.)

[51] 'Les Ursulines de Loudun se vouait à l'instruction des jeunes filles. . . Mais aû printemps de 1632, le bruit commença à se repandre dans la ville, que des choses étranges se

in Italy as the 'Dancing-Mania' or Tarantism[52]. During the middle ages it had appeared in Germany, and was called St. John's or St. Vitus's Dance[53]. And, long

passaient dans le nouveau couvent. . . Les religieuses firent part de leurs visions [au confesseur]; et il jugea ces choses fort graves. Il questionna ses pénitentes, et peut-être contribua-t-il à augmenter leur mal. . . La possédée eut de *convulsions*, qui furent très violentes. . . Cette crise passé, son visage reprit sa *tranquillité* et sa coloration habituelle. . . (1633) Les symptômes démoniaques reprisent soudainement à Loudun. . . Cinq autres religieuses se trouvèrent possédées. Dans la ville, dix filles seculaires étaient tourmentées. Bientôt, la ville ne suffisant plus à contenir cette nuée de démons, quelques-uns se cantonnèrent dans les lieux circonvoisins. . . Le corps de la prieure a été prosterné par terre, avec des *contorsions étranges* en tous ses membres: . . délivrée de ce diable, elle montrait un visage *si serein et si tranquille*, que les spectateurs y voyaient clairement le doigt de Dieu, et chantaient *Te Deum*. . . Cette maladie était un hystérie convulsive, avec diverses complications.' (Figuier, *Hist. de Merv.* i. 85, 112, 204, 238.) Within twenty years, the same phenomena had occurred in England among the Quakers: 'Consider [said Lord Saye, an Independent], after the prating woman Audley came to Banbury, what was done and practised: men and women falling down, foaming at the mouth, quaking, and using unnatural gestures.' (Peesley, *Hist. of Banbury*, p. 452.)

[52] 'At the close of the fifteenth century, *Tarantism* had spread beyond the borders of Apulia. . . The number of those affected by it increased beyond all belief. Inquisitive females joined the throng and caught the disease,—from the mental poison which they eagerly received *through the eye*. . . Foreigners of every colour and race were, in like manner, affected by it. Neither youth nor age afforded any protection; so that even old men of ninety threw aside their crutches, and joined the most extravagant dancers. . . Subordinate nervous attacks were much more frequent during this [seventeenth] century, than at any former period.' (Hecker, *Epidemics of the Middle Ages*, pp. 107–115, Engl. trans.)

[53] 'The effects of the *Black Death* had not yet subsided, when a strange delusion arose in Germany. It was a convulsion, which in the most extraordinary manner infuriated the human frame; . . and was propagated by the *sight* of the sufferers. They continued dancing, for hours together, in wild delirium; until at length they fell to the ground in a state of exhaustion. They then complained of extreme oppression, and groaned as if in the agonies of death. . . They were haunted by visions: and some of them afterwards asserted that they had felt as if immersed in a *stream of blood*, which obliged them to leap so high. [Cf. George Fox, *Journal*, i. 100: 'The word of the Lord came to me again. . . So I went up and down the streets, crying, Woe to the bloody city Lichfield! And there seemed to me to be a *channel of blood* running down the streets, and the market-place appeared like a pool of blood.'] Others saw the heavens open and the Saviour enthroned with the Virgin Mary,—according as the religious notions of the age were variously reflected in their imaginations.' (Hecker, *Epidemics*, p. 80.)

before its first appearance in that precise form, in 1374, it had, no doubt, been the real secret of the bacchanalian orgies among the Greeks, and of the frantic dervish-like gestures and 'cuttings with knives and lancets' which we read of among Asiatic races[54]. In our own day and country (thank God) these extraordinary and degrading spectacles are scarcely to be seen. But the disease still lurks among the superstitious Christians of Tigré in Abyssinia; in Siberia[55]; among the revivalists of Ireland and America; and (in a very mild form) among the ignorant Welsh Methodists,—who are on this account popularly called 'Jumpers.'

Now it so happened that these poor hysterical French refugees had arrived in great numbers in London[56], and had also visited Bristol, shortly before the critical year 1739,—when the excitable George Whitfield landed from America, and John Wesley returned home from Germany. Men's thoughts, then, were full of the (so-called) 'French prophets.' A new religious enthusiasm was, as it were, floating in the atmosphere. And it only needed the impulse of some exciting preaching, and the mental tension which is always produced among expectant and heated crowds, to generate infallibly an outbreak of this unaccountable and infectious malady. And such an occasion was not long in presenting itself. In February

[54] 'The Germans had transferred to the festival of St. John's Day an ancient heathen usage, the kindling of the Nodfyr (which was forbidden them by St. Boniface); and the belief subsists even to the present day, that people and animals that have *leaped* through these flames, are protected for a whole year from fevers, &c. . . The Greeks transferred to the festival of John the Baptist a part of their bacchanalian mysteries.' (Hecker, *Epid.* p. 87.)

[55] Cf. a curious account of the *Shamans* there, by a Russian traveller: ap. Horst, *Deuterosk.* i. 219–228.

[56] 'Dans sa froide *lettre sur l'enthusiasme*, Shaftesbury, parle des Prophètes protestants réfugiés qui *abondaient* en Angleterre, vers 1709. Il trouve leurs contorsions fort ridicules.' (Figuier, *Hist. de Merv.* ii. 395.)

1739, Whitfield for the first time preached in the open air,—at Kingswood, near his native place Bristol,—to the wild and lawless colliers of the then *Black Country* of England. In the May following he persuaded John Wesley to join him there, and to imitate his example. And then, for the first time, *religious hysteria* began to manifest itself[57]. Meeting after meeting and sermon after sermon were interrupted, by men and women of all ages and conditions falling down in convulsions, and crying aloud for mercy. 'Scores were sometimes strewed on the ground at once. A traveller was at one time passing by; but on pausing a moment to hear the sermon, he was directly smitten to the earth. A Quaker, who was admonishing the bystanders against these strange scenes, was himself struck down as by an unseen hand[58].'

It is obvious that, fitting, as it did so naturally, to the strenuous exhortations of these preachers of a 'sudden conversion,' and corresponding so well to the hopes they held forth of being sensibly and at a given moment 'born again,'—this phenomenon could not well fail of being interpreted by the ignorant crowd, as the miraculous birth-throes of the New Life; of being welcomed as the sensible strivings of the Holy Ghost with reluctant sinful souls; of being with awe accepted as the darkness and spiritual gloom out of which men should be presently redeemed into Christ's marvellous light[59].

---

[57] Stevens, *Hist.* i. 114, 126.

[58] Stevens, *Hist.* i. 127: cf. Tyerman, *Life*, i. 264–268: Bishop Lavington, *Enthus. of Meth.* [1750], part iii. p. 20.

[59] Similar nervous phenomena—'tears, sighs, and unutterable groanings; joy, mirth, and exultation,'—were (only a few years ago) supposed by Edward Irving to be a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost. Oliphant, *Life of Irving*, p. 329.)—'Of the more physical "fixed ideas," those of *Ambition* are the most frequent . . Next in frequency is the *Religious*. This manifests itself very

In all this matter, however, there is no doubt to be entertained that John Wesley was perfectly honest. Not a shadow of suspicion rests upon his integrity. But there is also no manner of doubt that he was extraordinarily superstitious; that the ghost-adventures of his youth had made a deep and permanent impression on his fancy[60]; and that he was as much inclined, as the Roman Catholic priests (with whom he was by his enemies so often confounded), to see miraculous interpositions in very trifling circumstances. Much more (of course) would this be the case in any important circumstances connected with his work as an Evangelist and preacher of repentance to the neglected heathens of Kingswood[61]. The one great characteristic

---

variously. It appears as profound melancholy, when combined with contrition for past sins, real or imaginary; as joyous extasy, when it is accompanied by the illusory feeling of special sanctification and divine grace, ("extasis religiosa.") Hence, deceptions of the *senses* are, in no form of the disease, so frequent as in this.' (Feuchtersleben, *Medic. Psychol.*, p. 280, Sydenham ed.) Shakespeare, *Julius Cæsar*, Act. v., seems to have had an intuition of this truth:—

> 'O hateful Error, Melancholy's child!
> Why dost thou show to the apt thoughts of men
> The things that are not?'

[60] Wedgwood, *John Wesley*, p. 22. —His friend, Alexander Knox thus writes about him: 'Had my good old friend possessed a sounder understanding, and a more cautious disposition, he might have been proportionably disqualified for his special destination . . Such, I conceive, was the native character of his intellectual machinery, that he was to be always liable to fallacious apprehension, false calculation, and disproportioned energy both of design and execution.' (Letter, appended to Southey, *Life*, [third ed.] ii. 465.)

[61] In 1739, Wesley writes as follows: 'I had an opportunity to talk with [Whitfield] of those *outward signs*, which had so often accompanied the inward work of God . . From this time, I trust, we shall all suffer God to carry on His own work in the way that pleaseth Him.' (Stevens, *Hist.*, i. 128.)—In 1743, however, he thinks 'it was Satan, tearing them as they were coming to Christ.' —But in 1781 he wavers again: 'Satan mimicked this part of the work of God, in order to discredit the whole: and yet it is not wise to *give up* this part, any more than to give up the whole.' (*Ibid.* p. 188.) —In his Sermon 37, however, *On the Nature of Enthusiasm*, (vol. i. p. 441,) he speaks like an English Churchman: 'Enthusiasm is, undoubtedly, a disorder of the mind . . It is not any part of religion:

doctrine, therefore, of Methodism—the doctrine of the 'new birth' or of the necessity of a *sensible conversion* from darkness to light and from Satan to God—became from this time forth doubly accentuated. And in spite of Wesley's own gradual return to a more tranquil, healthful, and Churchmanlike judgment on all these things; and notwithstanding his earnest protestations, even in his last days on earth, that he had 'never [consciously] varied from the doctrine of the Church at all;' this topic has continued to form the favourite theme of his preachers; the distinguishing—and alas! at length, the dividing—mark, which separates them from the Mother-Church. And so it has come to pass, that the followers of John Wesley—who 'lived and died a member of the Church of England,'—are preparing to enrol themselves under the banners of her natural enemy, and theirs,—*Calvinism.*

Yet it was precisely against Calvinism, that their venerable founder's voice spake with no uncertain sound, during all the latter half of his life. He used no weak or vague language on this subject. His expressions were, beyond mistake, those of protest and aversion. The Methodist Journal, during the whole of his life, was called (in downright terms) the *Arminian Magazine;* and he did not scruple, so early as 1741, in horror of Calvinism, to separate from his early friend and fellow-labourer, George Whitfield: while in the 'Larger Minutes' of Conference,—which form (as it were) the Canon Law of Methodism and are subscribed

---

quite the reverse. *Religion is the spirit of a sound mind* . . . Beware you are not entangled therewith! It easily besets those who fear or love God . . Trust not in visions or dreams; in sudden impressions, or strong impulses of any kind . . Beware, lastly, of imagining you shall obtain the end, without using the *means* conducive to it.'

to by every minister in the connexion,—there stand these uncompromising words: 'What is the direct *antidote* to Methodism? Calvinism. All the devices of Satan for these fifty years, have done far less towards stopping this work of God, than that single doctrine[62].'

(3) The subsequent history of Wesleyanism down to its founder's death in 1791, and the important Conference of 1795, forms its third period. And it is a story as interesting as it is full of instruction. But the popular works of Southey, Watson, and many others, are easily accessible. And it is therefore superfluous to attempt anything more in these pages, than a brief indication of the course and progress of its development. In 1744, amid the severe trials and anxieties of a period when Romanism, armed for the re-conquest of the country, was penetrating from Scotland into the midland counties, and Wesley was suspected of being secretly in the Pretender's interest,—he resolved to call around him his most trusted friends, and to take counsel for the continuance of their work[63]. Accordingly, six Methodist clergymen of the Church of England and four lay-preachers met together in London, for (what we should now call) a *Retreat.* And this meeting is regarded by Wesleyans as the first regular 'Conference' of the Methodist societies. Henceforward

---

[62] Ap. Warren, *Digest of the Laws of Meth.*, p. 42.

[63] 'Reports were rife, that the Methodist preachers were in collusion with the papal Stuart.' (Stevens, *Hist.*, i. 199.) Some confidently asserted 'that they had seen Mr. Wesley, a week or two ago, with the Pretender in France.' (Wesley, *Works*, xxviii. 216.) 'Every Sunday, (said Charles Wesley,) damnation is denounced against all who hear us; for we are Papists, Jesuits, and bringers-in of the Pretender.' (*Wesley with High Churchmen*, p. 122.) 'In Yorkshire, an accusation was laid against him of having spoken treasonable words.' (Southey, *Life*, p. 273.)

Conferences were held annually, in London, Bristol, or Leeds, — the three metropolitan cities of the great quasi-patriarchate controlled by Wesley. And when he was gone, this permanent synod of his nominees—entrusted with power to fill up their own vacancies—seemed the most natural body to succeed to his authority; as they were also the most likely to continue his traditions.

During the remainder of the century, therefore, England saw the remarkable spectacle of three distinct, though in most respects similar, organizations, permeating the country—for the purpose of awakening religious revival—in every direction. First came the original Moravian mission, conducted latterly by Ingham and Gambold[64]. Next came the High-Church, or Arminian, mission,—under John and Charles Wesley. Lastly, the Calvinistic mission, — under Whitfield and the Countess of Huntingdon. Each was animated by a pure and noble spirit of self-sacrifice. Each was attempting the truly Christian and blessed work of reviving religion among the now multiplying masses of the lower orders. Each was proceeding, on the whole, in the same way: viz. (1) by *stirring* men to ask, 'What shall I do to be saved?'—and that, especially, by highly-coloured addresses in the open air, wonderfully suitable to 'men of low estate,' and strongly affecting the imagination and the feelings of a class to whom the 'evidential' preaching of that day was like

[64] Rev. John Gambold is a very interesting person. He was rector of Stanton Harcourt, near Oxford; joined the Moravians in 1741; resigned his living in the following year; and became a 'bishop' among his new friends, in 1744. He was a man of pure life and high character; and was led to the Moravians by the earnest craving he felt for real spiritual fellowship,—too rare, at that time, within the Church. (Cf. Wedgwood, *John Wesley*, p. 75.)

speaking in an unknown tongue: (2) by *garnering* those whose hearts were touched, giving them a sense of brotherhood and welcome, and watching carefully against a relapse,—especially by an elaborate system of lay-agency, with class-leaders and local preachers to supplement the more regular efforts of the itinerant ministry.

At length—though his eye was not dim, nor his natural strength abated—John Wesley became an old man, and the time of his departure evidently drew nigh. It seemed advisable, therefore, to *establish* Wesleyanism firmly upon the basis of the law of the land. And Wesley drew up, in 1784, a 'Deed of Declaration,' which was formally enrolled in Chancery. It gave almost unlimited powers to the 'Conference;' entrusted it with the use of all the property belonging to the society, which even then was considerable; and virtually identified Methodism with the 'legal hundred' preachers, who were empowered to settle, by a majority of voices, all questions that might arise.

It is clear however that this was a long step taken—however unintentionally on the part of Wesley himself—in the direction of an ultimate separation from the Church of England. But a far more dangerous step was taken by him in this same year. Perplexed by the difficulties that had arisen out of the severance of the United States from the Mother Country[65], in despair

[65] 'The case (argued Wesley) is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction; in America there are none; neither any parish-ministers. So that, for some hundreds of miles together, there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end: and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest.' (Ap. Southey, *Life*, p. 515.)

at the timid counsels which prevailed among the English Bishops at that time[66], and confident (from a recent perusal of Lord King's book) that he was doing no more than re-asserting the ancient rights of the Presbyterate[67],—he brought himself, at last, to consecrate two English clergymen as bishops[68] (or 'superintendents'), and two laymen as presbyters (or 'elders'), for his American societies. This was the origin of the 'Episcopal Methodists' in the United States; who are now said to number two million adherents. But—explain it to himself as he might—there is no doubt that, in thus assuming Episcopal functions, John Wesley did what it was quite beyond his province to do; and that he thereby largely contributed to bring about the unhappy event, which (in words) he forbade, to his dying day, viz. *the secession of his societies from the Church of England*[69]. Had he only been a little more humble,

[66] 'It appears that some of his friends advised an application to the Bishops, requesting them to ordain preachers for America. Wesley replied, . . their proceedings were notoriously slow, and this matter admitted of no delay.' (*Ibid.* p. 514.)—Alas! the charge was only too true. The Bishops, at that period, must have lost all conception that it might possibly be a part of Episcopal duty to *suffer* something, and to *risk* something, to promote the general interests of the Church. Indeed, let any one read, with reflection, Bishop Wilberforce's *Hist. of the American Church*, pp 137-181, and he will find it absolutely impossible to speak another harsh word of Wesley's irregular proceedings in 1784. 'Letters and memorials from the colonies supply, *for a whole century* [1684-1784], a connected chain of expostulations. Yet still the mother country remained deaf to their entreaties . . It may well seem strange that their prayers were never granted.' (Wilberforce, *Hist.*, p. 149.)

[67] See above, p. 28.

[68] Stevens, *Methodist Episc. Church*, ii. 224.

[69] Five years after this unfortunate act, and only two years before his death, Wesley preached as follows, at Bath: 'The Methodists are still members of the Church;—such they desire to live and to die. And, I believe, one reason why God is pleased to prolong my life so long is, to confirm them in their present purpose, *not to separate from the Church*. . . I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England; I love her liturgy; I approve her plan of discipline. I do not knowingly depart from the rule of the Church, unless in those few cases where I

+ 1789

and 'let patience have her perfect work,'—*had he only waited ten weeks longer*, he would not have 'forced himself[70]' to supply, on September 2, 1784, the needed Episcopate, which was actually, on November 14, 1784, supplied by the Scottish consecration of Bishop Seabury[71].

Secession at home was indeed staved off, by his personal influence, for many years. But the *spirit* of separation and διχοστασία had already found its way among the Methodists,—as it always has done, and always will do, whenever the spirit of loyalty to the Church, of unity, and humility, becomes impaired. Accordingly, so early as 1740, the first interior secession took place, —Wesley and Whitfield departing from the 'Moravians,' on account of their excessive mysticism and their disparagement of the ordinary 'means of grace.' In 1741, a second severance occurred,—George Whitfield and the Calvinistic Methodists departing, and establishing that half-Presbyterian, half-Independent community, commonly known as 'Lady Huntingdon's Connexion.'

---

judge, and as far as I judge, there is an *absolute necessity* . . . Observe my two principles: (1) that I dare not *separate* from the Church, that I believe it would be a sin so to do: (2) that I believe it would be a sin not to *vary* from it, in the points above mentioned . . I have been true to my profession, from 1730 to this day.' (Wesley, *Sermon* cxv.; vol. iii. p. 267.)

[70] 1 *Sam.* xiii. 12.

[71] It is curious to observe how Wesley's assumption of episcopal functions was regarded at the time, and has been regarded since. (1) Dr. Coke himself distrusted it: (2) his brother, Charles Wesley, denounced it openly: (3) Dr. Whitehead, his friend and biographer, regarded it as an error of judgment: (4) another personal friend, Alexander Knox, attributed it to senility and infirmity of mind: (5) the Irish Methodists (so lately as 1839) avowed that the notions on which he acted are, 'in their judgment, more easily assumed than proved.' On the other hand, (6) the Conference, after his death, suppressed certain passages in his Journal, and omitted Sermon cxv. altogether; because they looked the other way: (7) Mr. Barrett elaborately defends the ordination: (8) Dr. Stevens in America, and Dr. Rigg in England, glory in it.

About 1750, the question of secession from the Church began already to be openly broached[72]. And in 1755, it was debated for three days at the annual Conference,—the decision being that, 'whether it was *lawful* or not, it was in no way *expedient* to separate from the Church.' The preachers therefore 'consented, for the sake of peace, to cease to administer the sacraments[73].' But when once this controversy had reached so low a level, as to be decided on mere grounds of 'expediency,' it is manifest that it had reached a position among mere shifting sands. What was a *duty* in 1755, would remain a duty still in 1795: but what was *expedient* (merely) in 1755, might easily come to appear inexpedient under altered circumstances. And so it actually came to pass. Wesley died in 1791. Four years later the long-prepared secession had taken place.

(4) It was at the annual Conference, held at Manchester in 1795, that the last link which kept the Wesleyans in union with the Church of England was severed. And with that event, therefore, the history of their society, as forming a separate denomination in this country, properly begins. The people, under the influence of their preachers, were clamouring loudly to have the sacraments administered to them in their own chapels; and the Conference was at last compelled to give way to their importunity. A 'Plan of Pacification' was drawn up; by which the preachers were authorized to administer the Lord's Supper, at such times and in such manner as the Conference should appoint. But

[72] 'Respecting the Conference of 1751, held at Bristol, Wesley expressed much anxiety. Many of his preachers were tired of his forbearance with the National clergy, and of the dependence of the Methodist societies upon them for the sacraments; and some of both preachers and societies were eager for open Dissent.' (Stevens, *Hist. of Meth.*, i. 394.)

[73] *Ibid.* p. 397.

no sooner was the severance complete, than its punishment began to be felt. Two years later, a large secession took place (1797),—under a minister named Kilham, —on the question of admitting lay-representatives to the annual Conference; and the *Methodist New Connexion* was formed. In 1810, the question of open-air preaching and of 'revivals' caused another schism; and the *Primitive Methodists* broke away from the parent body. In 1815, the *Bible Christians* seceded. In 1835, a quarrel broke out on the proposal to establish a Theological College; and an eminent minister, Dr. Warren, venturing to oppose the Conference and to appeal against them to the Court of Chancery, was expelled. The *Wesleyan Methodist Association* was therefore set on foot by his supporters. In 1849, a still farther division took place, owing to the same cause, viz. the very strong measures taken by the legal 'Conference' against a dissentient party. And in consequence, a new denomination, the *Wesleyan Methodist Reformers*, sprang into existence. Nor can any reasonable doubt be entertained, that the last of such secessions has not yet been seen[74]. For when once the spirit of loyalty and unity has given way, every attempt to supply its vacant place by mere laws, or deeds, or lines of demarcation, must inevitably fail. Interior decomposition has set in. And its destructive agency knows no limit, until every atom shall stand apart and separate from its fellow,—

[74] Thus, Mr. Tyerman (*Life of John Wesley*, vol. i.) actually boasts of the number of these 'branches of the Methodist family;' and describes no less than *nine* existing 'branches,' —besides many that have sprung up and died away again. At the present moment, a serious dissension is growing, on the subject of *retaining class-meetings as a test of membership*. And Mr. Hughes,—a minister who published a book on this subject in 1869,—has been reduced to the rank of a 'supernumerary,' by the Conference, at Manchester, in 1871.

until in short *Congregational Independency* is reached, or even *Unitarianism*, where every individual claims his own personal freedom to the uttermost.

But while truth compels me to say these things, candour also leads me most willingly to add, that—among all the religious bodies that modern times have produced—John Wesley's *Methodist Society* stood pre-eminent during his long lifetime; both for its wonderful efficiency and coherence, under the ubiquitous guidance of his masterly hand; and also for its persistent attachment to the Church of England, so long as he lived and so long as his distinct opinion was not deliberately suppressed and kept out of view, by the men of lower mould who succeeded him[75]. And,—whatever be its faults,—I boldly say, *so it stands pre-eminent still.* God forbid, that—whatever mistakes may have been committed, or whatever sinful tempers shown in these later times—a Churchman's voice should ever be raised, to disparage or treat with anything but honour, the memory and the work of the purest, noblest, most saintly clergyman of the eighteenth century. Here was a man, whose whole life was passed in the sincere and loyal effort to do good. 'Persons came to me, and desired me to advise and to pray with them . . My desire was to live and die in retirement. But I did not see that I could refuse them my help, and be guiltless before God[76].' Thus his efforts were directed towards an object, which we should all, I trust, in those days have had at heart, and which (be it remarked) his efforts have actually brought to pass,—though neither *when* he thought, nor

[75] See letter of Alexander Knox [1828],—a personal friend of Wesley's,—ap. Southey, *Life*, ii. 411, (third ed., 1846.)

[76] 'Large Minutes,' ap. Warren, *Digest*, p. 23.

precisely *as* he thought. That object was, to revive religion within the Church of England; to re-infuse life and energy into her benumbed and stiffening limbs; to pour into all the old time-honoured channels, a fresh current of evangelizing zeal; and to recover—in time and ere a heathenized democracy should rudely seize the reins of power and precipitate England into chaos—the lower orders to an efficient and soul-converting Christianity[77].

For the subsequent secession—if it be indeed yet a 'secession'—of Methodism from the Church, John Wesley is not himself responsible. He warded off so great a calamity during all his life. He wrote, he spoke, he protested against it, in every way that was open to a man in the singular position he occupied. Nay, he earnestly endeavoured to prevent the possibility of its occurrence,—though he foresaw that it might occur,—after he should himself be gone. Only nine months before his death, he solemnly charged his preachers: 'In God's name, stop there! Be Church-of-England men still! Do not cast away the peculiar glory, which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence[78].' And his dying breath was spent in a prayer for the Church.

But even if it must be 'secession,' even if (with strange want of independence and of foresight) the leaders of this massive religious society—which could surely claim to strike out a policy of its own—are tamely led to join the Puritan crusade against their Mother-Church, still it shall not be from our lips that rebuke or blame shall come. The work for God, in which they have been so

[77] Cf. Stevens, *Methodist Episcopal Church*, i. 26.
[78] Wesley, *Sermons*, iii. 268.

signally blest,—their zeal and devotion, which so often put our cold officialism to shame,—these shall stop our mouths from uttering one word of harshness or unbrotherly disparagement. No: it is to their own 'venerable father[79]' and founder that we will appeal,—if appeal we must. And he 'being dead, yet speaketh' in condemnation of such unnatural and un-Wesleyan courses. 'It is one of the *fixed rules* of our societies (he says), that every member attend the ordinances of God, i.e. do not divide from the Church[80].' And again, 'I never had any design of separating from the Church; I have no such design now. . . Nevertheless, in spite of all I can do, many will separate from it; although, I am apt to think, not one half, perhaps not a third of them. These will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party; which, consequently, will dwindle away into a dull, dry, separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare that I live and die a member of the Church of England; and NONE WHO REGARD MY OPINION OR ADVICE WILL EVER SEPARATE FROM IT[81].'

These last words were written by him only a few months before his death. And the neglect and disobedience with which they have since been treated, have already been amply avenged by the many internal secessions which have split the connexion in pieces.

---

[79] Minutes of 1797, &c.

[80] Wesley, *Works*, xiv. 161.

[81] John Wesley, *Arminian Magazine*, April 1790. How true-hearted Wesleyans can cast such words as these to the winds, it is difficult to understand. But they *are* now-a-days cast to the winds, without scruple and without apology. 'The Methodist community are not bound to receive everything that John Wesley said. That prince of evangelists was often inconsistent with himself: and on no subject did he mystify himself more completely, than on that of the connexion of his societies with the Church of England.' (*The Meth. World*, Jan. 1870, p. 55.)

The consequence has been,—not only an enormous waste of power, not only endless jealousies and confusions, arising from the co-existence of so many intertangled systems of rival 'circuits' and rival 'conferences' throughout the country,—but a serious diminution of numbers during the last few years. According to their own returns, since 1850 their adherents have diminished by no less than 11,174 persons: and the annual rate of diminution appears to be increasing [82].

And surely we, who remain loyal members of the Church of England, ought—in two ways especially—to derive instruction from the deeply interesting spectacle afforded us by the past history, and the present condition, of Wesleyanism.

(1.) We should learn the *negative* lesson: viz. *to guard against the danger of 'drifting' into disunion*, and against the sin of pushing our ecclesiastical dissensions to the sad extremity of mutual alienation and of actual Dissent. That gulf may possibly seem narrow, and of little account, in your eyes. But it is like the parted cliff, where seas rush in and work an ever-widening disruption. It is like the severed limb, whose mischief might once—ah, how easily! perhaps—have been re-absorbed and cured without a scar; but which now the surgeon's knife, with a little narrow cleft, has for ever made a 'mutilation.' It is like the alienation of hearts which once have loved; and the blight of whose gradual estrangement neither silence nor distance can ever effectually cure [83].

---

[82] Ap. *Derbysh. Churchman*, Jan. 1872.

[83] 'Da schieden sie. Und, wie im Münsterchor
Verglimmt der Altarlampe rother Glanz—
Erst wird er matt; dann flackert er empor
Noch einmal hell, und dann verlischt er ganz—

(2.) But still more earnestly, if possible, should we Churchmen arouse ourselves to learn the all-important *positive* and practical lesson, that Wesleyanism—by its wonderful successes—ought to teach us. And that lesson is, above all things (in the words of my text), *to 'condescend to men of low estate.'* In Dr. Johnson's judgment—who lived in the midst of the great Methodist movement,—the whole secret of its success was, that the preachers 'expressed themselves in a plain and familiar manner, which is the only way to do good to the common people; and which clergymen of genius and learning ought to do from a principle of duty.' We know it was something more than that. But still, one clear lesson of Methodism is here pointed out to us. *The lower classes cannot be drawn to religion, by dry and cold addresses to their reason*, which in them is only half cultivated. We must not, therefore, be afraid of appealing to their emotions. We must not shrink from touching their enthusiasm. We must not allow *refinement* to stand between us and our Master's work [84]. But we must venture to incur some risks, and even approach—while we diligently guard against—the evils of fanaticism. Nor again, can persons of this class—nor perhaps of any class—be *kept* in the ways of religion, without some sort of Methodism: i.e. without some skilfully devised plans for religious association and

---

So starb die Lieb' in ihnen, erst beweint,
Dann heiss zurück ersehnt, und dann—vergessen:
Bis sie zuletzt, es sei ein Wahn, gemeint
Dass sie sich je dereinst bessessen.'

(Geibel, *Gedichte*, p. 141.)

[84] 'What are the rules of a "helper" [local-preacher]? . . Do not affect the *gentleman*. You have no more to do with this character, than with that of a dancing-master. A preacher of the gospel is the servant of all. Be ashamed of nothing but sin: not of cleaning your own shoes, or your neighbour's.' (Large Minutes; Warren, *Digest*, p. 23.)

mutual help. Wesley's own experience taught him this last truth. For on one occasion he tried to effect a revival of religious enthusiasm in the northern counties, *without* afterwards garnering up the results in 'class-meetings' and societies; but he found that all his labour had been spent in vain, and that 'almost all the seed had fallen by the wayside[85].'

Now of all institutions the world has ever seen, there is one which—fully understood and boldly set in motion—is beyond all comparison the most effective, for reaching and enkindling the hearts of all men, of the lowly as well as the refined. And that is the ancient Catholic system of the Church. This system God, in His mercy, has left us—reformed, indeed, but in its grand features wholly unimpaired—in this country. This He has placed in our hands. This He has entrusted to our loyalty, committed to our courage, commended to our skill. And it is entirely our own fault if it becomes effete or lifeless under our charge. 'Circuits' (after all) are not nearly so efficient as *parishes:* 'superintendents' are not so good as *bishops:* a 'conference' can hardly compete with a graduated system of *church synods:* a *twelve days' mission* is a healthier thing than a 'camp-meeting.' *Confirmations*, catechizings, and a free system of Bible, communion, and prayer-meetings, might easily be made to compete with

[85] 'We have preached for more than a year without forming *societies*, . . from Newcastle to Berwick; and almost all the seed has fallen by the wayside.' (Minutes of 1748: ap. Stevens, *Hist.* i. 324.) Legh Richmond, at Turvey (1805–1827), attempted to draw people together on the more wide and common ground of Friendly Societies. 'The good effects of these *societies* were universally felt, . . and a respect for religion gave a sacred character to the whole.' (Grimshawe, *Life of Richmond*, p. 93.) The modern (so-called) Catholic revival, aims at precisely the same thing, in its *guilds*.

'class-meetings,' too often led by ignorant (though pious) men[86]. And the *private fatherly counsel*, which the Prayer-book allows each person, fallen under spiritual difficulty or sorrow, to seek for himself among the ten thousand priests of the Church of England, is beyond comparison superior to the public confession of experiences in a narrow band-meeting,—where (in all human probability) virtues and transports and triumphs are far more likely to be confessed, than failures and sins.

In all these, and many other ways, then, we have need to be astir, and to aid in solving happily that great problem of the future influence of Christianity upon the democracy, on which (as we have lately been truly told) 'depends the future existence of Christianity, for a century to come, as the ruling religious power of the civilized world[87].' And if we should, in doing this, have to 'condescend to men of low estate,' to stoop from our studies and our speculations, to translate into mother English the net results of our inquiries, to approach men through their imaginations and their senses, and even to bear patiently with their strange superstitions and crude notions about the unseen world,—let us remember that this is the very way by which God's servants have in all ages gone before us; the very way by which they have done their Master's work, and trodden in their Master's footsteps. Therefore we too may safely take from these low and crude beginnings our starting-point—as St. Paul took his from the pagan sacrifice at

[86] 'Of what use is it to try and make a class-meeting beneficial to any one who is not [already] in earnest? .. It will not suffice that the same inquiry be always made: "How are you getting on? how is it with you?" [rather ask], "Do you enjoy the life of God? are you diligent in the study of the Bible?"' (*Primitive Meth. Magazine*, Jan. 1870, p. 27.)

[87] Clay, *Essays*, p. 2.

Lystra, or from the 'altar to the unknown God' at Athens. And we can hardly do better than follow St. Augustine's example, in dealing with rude and half-awakened souls: 'If any one should tell us, he has been warned or terrified by some supernatural means into becoming a Christian, he thereby offers us a most welcome *starting-point:* and we at once take occasion to point out how great a care God has for our souls. Thus we may lead him on to the safer and more solid ground of scriptural theology; . . and may show him, that the Lord would not have thus instructed him by signs and revelations, were there not a *highway* already laid down in the Holy Scriptures, wherein He had desired him to walk[88].'

[88] Augustine, *De Cat. Rud.* § 10.

# APPENDIX K.

## *The Special Doctrines of the Wesleyans.*

The two characteristic doctrines of the modern Wesleyans are those of the NEW-BIRTH, and of PERFECTION.

(1) *The doctrine of the New-Birth* is nothing else than the theory, that a person is not made a 'Christian' by being christened; but rather, when he passes through a certain convulsive crisis of the inner life, from out of which he issues with a strong *feeling* of serenity and acceptance with God. This 'feeling' is construed as 'the witness of the Spirit with our spirit.' And the person is supposed to be, then for the first time, justified, converted, made a 'Christian.' Hence, the main efforts of Methodist preachers are (naturally) directed towards producing this crisis: and revivals, camp-meetings, and terrifying appeals to the imagination, become—in coarser hands—the means of bringing it to pass. The Church, on the contrary, positively refuses to regard immature persons as outside the Christian pale; and teaches that the *normal* growth in grace is—not this attainment of a high religious consciousness *per saltum*, but—'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.' At the same time, she fully admits those—very numerous, but still exceptional—cases, where (the Holy Spirit having been long grieved and resisted) God's mercy puts a man to wholesome shame, by treating him as a relapsed heathen, and sending him a—'Conversion.' On this subject however, as on all others, every Wesleyan minister may be compelled, by the Court of Chancery, to preach in accordance with 'certain Notes on the New Testament, and the first four volumes of Sermons, published by the late Rev. John Wesley.' In those sermons are contained the following passages:—

'A man may possibly be born of water, and yet not be born of the Spirit. I do not now speak with regard to infants: it is certain that our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are, at the same time, "born again;" and it is allowed that the whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds upon this supposition. Nor is it an objection of any weight against this, that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it can be wrought in a person of riper years. But whatever be the case with the infants, it is sure all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again. The tree is known by its fruits.' (*Serm.* 45, vol. ii. p. 69, ed. 1838.) 'I ask not whether you *was* born of water and of the Spirit; but are you *now* the temple of the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in you? I allow you

was "circumcised with the circumcision of Christ" (as St. Paul emphatically terms baptism): but does the Spirit of Christ and of glory *now* rest upon you? . . Unto you I call, in the name of Him whom ye crucify afresh, . . "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" How, indeed, except ye be born again? For ye are now dead in trespasses and sins. To say, then, that ye cannot be born again, that there is no "new-birth" but in baptism, is to seal you all under damnation. . . Who denies that ye were then made children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven? But, notwithstanding this, ye are now children of the devil. Therefore, ye must be born again.' (*Serm.* 18, vol. i. p. 208.) 'The most common of all the Enthusiasts of this kind are those who imagine themselves Christians and are not. That they are not Christians, is clear and undeniable, if we believe the oracles of God. For Christians are holy; these are unholy. Christians love God; these love the world. . . Yet they imagine themselves so to be: for they have been called so, ever since they can remember; they were *christened* many years ago: . . Ah, poor self-deceivers! Christians ye are not.' (*Serm.* 37, vol. i. p. 442.)

Such language is well meant: but in practice it leads inevitably towards the formation of small and exclusive sects, jealously guarding their own 'purity.' And when coupled with the former incorrect language about the 'new birth,' it paves the way for that which its author, all through his life, most feared and deprecated,—viz. a contempt for the Church's doctrine about baptism, the invention of a new mark of admission to the privileges of a 'Christian' other than that authorized by Christ, and an eventual decision that the 'society' of such regenerated people has a better right to the style and title of a 'Church' than the old (apparently) lax community which had for ages usurped that name. And this is, in effect, a lapse into Puritanism.

(2) *The second leading doctrine of Wesleyanism is that of Perfection*,—in other words, the theory that a person, on being (in the Wesleyan sense) 'born again,' is *at once* translated from darkness to light; that he attains *at once* the maturity (τελειότης) which the Churchman—with his 'sacramenta' and careful self-culture—painfully and often unsuccessfully gropes after; and that such a person can take the words of St. John upon his lips, 'He that is born of God sinneth not.' This is, again, nothing else than an unguarded statement of the Church's doctrine of 'assurance;' a privilege which she holds out as attainable, *in ever increasing* (*or abating*) *degree*, in proportion as a man faithfully 'fights the good fight of faith' and becomes 'stablished, strengthened, settled,' by the long indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the temple of his heart. On this subject John Wesley writes as follows:—

'So it is with him that is born of God. Before that great change is wrought, although he subsists by Him in whom all that have life "live

and move and have their being," yet he is not *sensible* of God; he does not *feel*, he has no inward consciousness of His presence. . . But when he is born of God, born of the Spirit, how is the manner of his existence changed! His whole soul is now sensible of God; . . the eyes of his understanding are now open, and he seeth Him that is invisible; . . his ears are now opened, . . and he has a clear intercourse with the invisible world. . . Now one who is so born of God . . not only doth not commit sin, while he thus keepeth himself, but so long as this seed remaineth in him, he cannot sin,—because he is born of God. . . But here a difficulty will immediately occur. It is plain, in fact, that those whom we cannot deny to have been truly born of God, nevertheless not only could, but did, commit sin, even gross outward sin. Thus David was unquestionably thus born of God. . . And yet such a child of God could commit sin; yea, the horrid sins of adultery and murder. . . I answer, he did not "keep himself," by that grace of God which was sufficient for him. He fell, step by step, first into negative inward sin; . . then into positive inward sin, inclining to wickedness in his heart; . . next, he lost his faith, his sight of a pardoning God, and consequently his love of God; and being then weak and like another man, he was capable of committing outward sin.' (*Serm.* 19, vol. i. p. 212.)

In other words, the great '*privilege of those that are born of God*' amounts to this: they cannot commit sin, until they begin to commit sin. And if that be all, the Church's more guarded doctrine of 'assurance' appears preferable: especially as it avoids the error of supposing that God's eye cannot see, in many a case of 'sancta simplicitas,' the germs of a very high potential spirituality. Into this error the following passage seems to fall:—

'The great question of all, then, still remains. Is the love of God shed abroad in your heart? Can you cry out, "My God and my all!" Do you desire nothing but Him? Are you happy in God? Is He your glory, your delight, your crown of rejoicing? . . If any man die without this faith and this love, good were it for him that he had never been born.' (*Serm.* 2, vol. i. p. 21.)

# APPENDIX L.

## *Extracts from three important documents of Wesleyanism.*

Of these three documents, the *first*, (says Dr. Warren, *Digest*, p. 1,) 'on account of its great importance to the whole Connexion, may justly be called the Magna Charta of Methodism.' It is the Deed of Declaration by which (if we may so say) John Wesley 'established' Methodism; by describing, in legal language, the conditions under which its property

should be held, and then enrolling the deed 'in His Majesty's High Court of Chancery.' It is dated Feb. 28, 1784.—The *second* is the celebrated 'Plan of Pacification;' whereby Wesleyanism, after its founder's death, virtually severed itself from the Church of England and became a Dissenting Communion. It is dated August 6, 1795.—The *third* is the 'Model Trust Deed;' under the terms of which it is 'strongly recommended by Conference' that all future chapels, houses, and other property of the Connexion, should be secured. It is dated July 3, 1832.

(1) *The Deed of Declaration:*—'To all to whom these presents shall come, John Wesley—late of Lincoln College, Oxford, but now of the City Road, London, clerk—sendeth greeting. Whereas divers buildings, commonly called chapels, with a messuage and dwelling-house, or other appurtenances, to each of the same belonging, situate in various parts of Great Britain, have been given and conveyed from time to time . . . upon trust, that the trustees . . should permit and suffer such persons . . as should be appointed at the yearly Conference of the people called Methodists . . , and no others, to have and enjoy the said premises for the purposes aforesaid: . . . Now therefore, the said John Wesley doth hereby declare that the Conference . . . hath always heretofore consisted of the preachers and expounders of God's Holy Word . . whom he hath thought expedient, year after year, to summon to meet him, to advise with them for the promotion of the Gospel of Christ, . . and for the expulsion of unworthy and admission of new persons under his care, and into his connexion, to be preachers and expounders as aforesaid . . And these presents further witness, that the several persons hereinafter named [one hundred in number], . . now are the members of the said Conference . . subject to the regulations hereinafter prescribed: that is to say, . . No act of the Conference shall be had, taken, or be the act of the Conference, . . until all the vacancies occasioned by death, or absence, shall be filled up by the election of new members [by coöptation], *so as to make up the number of one hundred:* and during the assembly of the Conference, there shall always be forty members present at the doing of any act . . The duration of the yearly assembly of the Conference shall not be less than five days, nor more than three weeks . . The Conference shall and may expel and put out from being a member thereof, or from being in connexion therewith, or from being upon trial, any person . . , from any cause which to the Conference may seem fit or necessary . . The Conference shall not appoint any person, *for more than three years successively*, to the use and enjoyment of any chapels and premises, . . except ordained ministers of the Church of England . . . Whenever the said Conference shall be reduced under the number of forty members, and continue so reduced for three yearly assemblies thereof successively,—or whenever the members thereof shall decline or neglect to meet together annually for the purposes aforesaid during the space of three years,—then

the Conference of the people called Methodists shall be extinguished, . . and the said chapels, &c., shall vest in the trustees for the time being . . , upon trust that they shall appoint such persons to preach therein . . , as to them shall seem proper.' . . .

(2) *The Plan of Pacification:*—'The sacrament of the Lord's Supper shall not be administered in any chapel, except a majority of the trustees of that chapel . . , and of the stewards and leaders belonging to that chapel (as the best qualified to give the sense of the people), allow of it. Nevertheless, in all cases, the consent of the Conference shall be first obtained . . Provided that, *in all chapels where the Lord's Supper has been already peaceably administered, the administration of it shall continue in future* . . We agree that the Lord's Supper be administered among us, on Sunday evenings only; except where the majority of the stewards and leaders desire it in Church hours . . Nevertheless, it shall never be administered on those Sundays on which it is administered in the parish Church. The Lord's Supper shall always be administered in England, *according to the form of the Established Church:* but the person who administers shall have liberty to give out hymns, to use exhortation, and extemporary prayer. Wherever Divine Service is performed in England on the Lord's day, in Church hours, the officiating preacher shall read either the service of the Church, our venerable father's abridgment, or at least the lessons appointed by the calendar. But we recommend either the full service or the abridgment. The appointment of the preachers shall remain solely with the Conference . . . The hundred preachers mentioned in the enrolled deed, and their successors, are the only legal persons who constitute the Conference. And we think the junior brethren have no reason to object to this proposition, as they are regularly elected according to seniority.'

(3) *The Model Trust-deed:*—It first recites the origin of the Methodist Societies in 1738; it next notices the first formation of Conference in 1744: then recites the *Deed of Declaration,* &c.: and next recites a contract for the purchase of a piece of ground, &c. . . 'upon trust, to permit the said chapel and premises to be used as a place of worship for the people called Methodists . . and to allow such persons only to preach and expound therein, as should be duly appointed by Conference, or by the superintendent preacher for the time being . . [who shall] have the direction and control of the said worship . . Provided always, that no person shall be permitted to preach or expound in the said chapel or premises, who shall teach any doctrine contrary to what is contained in certain *Notes to the New Testament* by the late John Wesley, and the *first four volumes of Sermons* reputed to be written by him.' . . . . . .

# LECTURE VIII.

## THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

A.D. 597.

*Leading Idea*:—A federation of National and Mission Churches.

*Method adopted*:—A bold adaptation of the ancient Catholic system to modern times.

*Ἂν μὲν οὖν δὴ καὶ ξυνεπιλαμβάνηταί τις ὀρθὴ τροφὴ παιδεύσεως, ὁλόκληρος ὑγιής τε παντελῶς,—τὴν μεγίστην ἀποφυγὼν νόσον—γίγνεται [ὁ ἄνθρωπος]· καταμελήσας δὲ, χωλὴν τοῦ βίου διαπορευθεὶς ζωὴν, ἀτελὴς καὶ ἀνόητος εἰς Ἅιδου πάλαι ἔρχεται.* (Plato, *Timæus*, p. 43: ed. Stalb.)

# CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

200. British (Welsh) Church first mentioned. (Tertullian, *c. Judæos*, § 7.)
314. Council of Arles: three British bishops present.
400. Pelagius, a British 'heretic,' at Rome.
457. English (pagan) invasions: first kingdom, Kent.
582. English occupation complete: last kingdom, Mercia.

---

597. English Church founded, by Augustin, at Canterbury.
664. All England christianized, mainly by 'British' clergy. Council at Whitby.
680. *First Reform* (Archbishop Theodore). Organization completed.
785. New organization attempted by Offa. Higbert, Archbishop of Lichfield.
970. *Second Reform* (Archbishop Dunstan). Discipline braced up.
1070. *Third Reform* (Archbishop Lanfranc). Continental improvements in ritual (Sarum use), &c.
1140. Canon law introduced into England.
1164. Constitutions of Clarendon: Archbishop Becket, †1171.
1213. Papal supremacy culminates, under King John.
1221. *Fourth Reform:* Franciscan revival of religion. Bishop Grostête, †1253.
1279. Parliament resists the Papacy. Statute of 'Mortmain' (1389, 'Premunire.')
1350. Lollards rebel against the Established Church. Wicliffe, †1384.
1400. Statute 'De heretico comburendo.' (Sawtre, †1401: Cobham, †1418.)
1429. Archbishop Chicheley resists the intrusion of a Papal legate.
1457. Bishop Pecocke deposed for Rationalism.
1530. *Fifth Reform* (Archbishop Warham): Papal supremacy rejected.
1539. Monasteries converted into new Sees, new Cathedral chapters, &c. many suppressed.
1559. English Church restored, after Queen Mary's reaction.
1660. „ „ after the Great Rebellion.
1689. 'Toleration Act:' efforts towards 'comprehension of Dissenters.'
1739. *Sixth Reform*, begun: 'Evangelical' revival, Wesley and Whitfield.
1833. 'Catholic' revival begun at Oxford.
1871. Puritan attempt to 'liberate the Church from State control.'

# LECTURE VIII.

## THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

'How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob! and thy tabernacles, O Israel!—As the valleys are they spread forth; as gardens by the river-side: as the trees of lign aloes which the Lord hath planted.'—*Numb.* xxiv. 5, 6.

FOR the completion of the task undertaken in these Lectures,—viz. a study of the leading forms of Dissent in this country, and of their relation to the National Church,—it only now remains to gather up the various threads of our inquiry, and to knot them into a conclusion. We have passed in review,—I trust, in no censorious or unfriendly spirit, although with outspoken truthfulness—six of the more important Denominations, which now exist in England. We have noticed how curiously they fall into pairs; and how each pair represents the two extreme poles of ecclesiastical thought, which prevailed respectively in the sixteenth, the seventeenth, and the eighteenth centuries. We have seen too how each denomination finds its counterpart, and point of attachment, within the Church of England itself; each being, in reality, nothing else than an interior *dissension*—such as always must exist in a free and healthy Church—carried to a dangerous extreme, and ripened into exterior *dissent*. And we have observed, accordingly, that

each separated communion—unlike any really foreign and irreconcilable form of religion, such as Brahminism or Positivism—offers important lessons for the Mother Church; and ought to awaken, among those to whose fidelity and statesmanship she is committed, the most anxious reflections, as to the possibility of improving her arrangements and of re-enkindling the dormant enthusiasm of her children.

For no one can surely doubt, that the Church of England might, with a very little skill, be made to root herself far more deeply in the affections of her own people than she has ever yet done[1]. No one, whose vision is not narrowed by partizanship, can doubt that she might, even now,—with a good deal of prudence and self-devotion,—be made once more (virtually) the Church of this whole nation. No one ought to doubt that, once reunited and self-disciplined she might, ere many generations were over, fulfil that magnificent part in the unfolding drama of history, to which her Divine Master seems to be every day more clearly calling and fitting her,—viz. to become the reconciler of the great divisions of Christendom, and the peacemaker among the nations of the earth.

In making her approaches towards the fulfilment of

[1] According to a carefully constructed 'Balance-sheet of the Church of England,' lately published by the 'Yorkshire Union of Church Institutes,' the *voluntary* contributions entrusted annually to her management amount to £5,445,298: while the entire gross amount of her standing endowments only amount to £4,200,255. Add to this, the testimony of men whom no one can accuse of bigoted attachment to her cause: 'I know not that the Church of England, as regards London, was ever stronger than now.' (Ritchie, *Religious Life of London*, p. 80.) 'Never were her services so well attended; never were her clergy more useful than now... In the East [of London], *where the poverty is too great to admit of the existence of a church on Dissenting principles*, the church is in some parishes the only place of worship, and the church-clergyman the only religious teacher.' (*Ibid.* p. 82.)

this most blessed task, the main hindrance in her way is disunion within the borders of our English Christendom. We have all observed how a very trifling and accidental derangement will sometimes bring to a complete stop the most elaborate, and otherwise effective, machine. And history is full of lessons, which should teach us how the admixture of a little obstinate self-will, or the outbreak of a mutinous temper, will utterly paralyse the energy of the most imposing forces; will reduce an army to a mere helpless crowd; a fleet to absolute inaction; and a state to weakness and chaos. Just so it is with the Church of Jesus Christ. These miserable separations, which we all deplore,—we may well deplore them. For they have drawn off into, I know not how many, independent, inefficient, and mutually hostile denominations, a great number of just those persons, whose genuine piety and manly simplicity of character should have placed them among the foremost ranks, in the Church's battle array against ignorance, superstition, and sin.

It is true that many of these separated bodies appear now to be weakening, to be diminishing in numbers, and falling apart into innumerable fragments. But this fact does not in any way affect the question. We are all bound, by our duty to our brethren and to God, to 'follow peace with all men.' We are bound to study every method of conciliation and of mutual goodwill. We are under the strictest obligation to explain, as clearly as we can, both to the Dissenters and to our own less instructed people, the true position and standing purpose of the Church of England. And as to the present embittered assaults—which probably indicate a consciousness that the power of making them is rapidly passing away—every Churchman should remember, that the only revenge which Christ has taught us is that of returning

good for evil. The only retaliation possible to the follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, is to ask clearly and simply, 'Why smitest thou me?' The only offensive warfare allowable to a Christian is, 'to instruct in meekness them that oppose themselves.'

For, indeed, there is no doubt whatever that, in innumerable instances, it is nothing else than want of instruction as to the Church's meaning, which has arrayed people in hostility against her. There is not, it would seem, to this hour, any intelligent—that is to say any *real*—aversion either to her doctrines or to her system, among the mass of the English people. It is partly ignorance, and partly unwarrantable misrepresentations, which have thrown them into an attitude of indifference[2]. And we must all have seen for ourselves, in various parts of the country, how the Church's full system, boldly and prudently displayed, has at once distanced all competition; and has drawn forth an instinctive response to those aspects of God's Beauty, Truth, and Order, which have been especially committed to her keeping. Nor is testimony wanting to the same effect, from many who have been Dissenters themselves, and who have had the fullest

[2] Mr. Baldwin Brown pleasantly describes the Church of England as 'a church gorged with ill-distributed wealth, cumbered with worldly trappings, and fed by legal exactions:' (art. in *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1871)—all being phantoms of his own imagination, except the 'ill-distribution;' which, however, is being rapidly amended by the Ecclesiastical Commission and other agencies.—'In pamphlet ii. we have a charming picture of the style in which the average Welsh clergyman lives: "a pretty little villa, or a good-sized mansion; a nice little phaeton, or a carriage and pair; means to keep a couple of servants and sometimes a groom; and may be, a few hounds." Further.. the author gives two statements, which show that the average value of benefices in the diocese of St. David's is £137 per annum; and in Llandaff £177. Does he mean to affirm that even the "nice little phaeton" can be kept on £150 a year in any part of Wales?' (*The Church in Wales*, Rivingtons, 1871.) It is clear that the authors of these invidious statements simply overlook the fact, that the clergy often possess private property.

opportunity for comparing the two systems together. 'Nonconformists (say they) are, in general, simply conformists to the societies in which they are born; and the natural prejudice of association takes the place of intelligent conviction. For the most part, they see only their own side; and have strange uncouth pictures placed before them by their own artists, purporting to represent the inhabitants of that unknown land, the *terra incognita* of the National Church[3].'

For such misrepresentations, of course, we Churchmen are not responsible. But for the enormous and incredible *ignorance* that prevails, both within and around our own communion, we are in a great degree responsible. And every Sunday-school teacher throughout the land, every district-visitor, every godfather and godmother, ought to feel the keenest shame, when they hear what the Colonial clergy say about the ignorance and apathy of the emigrant Churchmen who come under their charge,—ignorance of the very simplest ecclesiastical matters; ignorance of the first principles of Churchmanship, or that there are any such principles; ignorance of Church history; ignorance of symbolism; ignorance of almost every doctrine,—at least of the secondary and auxiliary kind,—'which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health[4].'

[3] Brewin Grant [late Independent], *Dissenting reasons for joining the Church*, p. 45.—'Friends have a notion, which is one of the grounds of their prejudice, that the outward ordinances are depended upon [in the Church], as substitutes for Christian virtue and graces.' (J. W. C. *Reasons for leaving the Society of Friends, and joining the Church*, p. 32.)—'The case of the devout and intelligent Protestant, when speculated upon by the Roman Catholic critic, . . is as hopeless a puzzle as an intelligent dog is to us men.'—(*Reasons for returning to the Church of England;* Strahan, 1871.)

[4] 'The poorer classes among the Roman Catholics are so well trained in the distinctive principles of their religion, that they seldom leave it for any other; and they are rarely unable to render a distinct account of what they believe. With the

But above all, we clergy have to confess our miserable shortcomings, and that 'we are verily guilty concerning our brother.' For a whole century, we neglected to unfold to our people any rational theory of the Church at all. We forbore to give them any information about her history, her laws, her customs, her great men. We refused to present to their imagination the glorious *ideal*, which she was intended by her founder gradually to realize in the world. We were content to copy the meagre methods of a (so-called) Evangelical Dissent,—methods irreconcilable with our own Prayer-book at every turn. We invited men to 'come to Jesus;' without ever pointing out to them the easy way, amply furnished with helps and *sacramenta*, by which He bade them come. We neither knew, nor cared to discover, the rich treasures stored up for us in the Rituals, the Lections from Holy Scripture, the Creeds, the Hymns, the elaborate synodal and hierarchical arrangements of our own Church. And the consequence was,—as might have been expected,—that all enthusiasm for her, as an institution, died out; and the time at length arrived, when the enemy thought his hour was come, by one decisive effort, to overthrow her and trample her finally under his feet.

All such hopes, however, are evidently doomed to disappointment. Everywhere, men are displaying an eager anxiety to know more about the Church's true system. And the more they come to know of it, the more their conviction grows that it is restoration and *adaptation* that are wanted, and not destruction or (what is called) 'disestablishment.' Even in places of

Church of England, unhappily, it is not so. . . While four-fifths of the children in England pass through Church of England schools, Dissent has been increasing.' (Fisher, *Liturg. Revision*, p. 544.)

science like this University, it is believed that our Church has only fearlessly to throw herself upon her own proper resources, to defend such privileges and endowments as are really hers, and to display no unworthy dread of a thorough study of theology, in order to commend her doctrine, her ritual and her discipline, to the rising generation of Englishmen.

For the more vigorously science grows, the better its instruments, the more accurate and complete its research,—the more certainly every day is the conviction approached, which Kant has thus formulated: 'The principles of Reason, as applied to Nature, *do not conduct to any Theological truths*[5].' And the more earnestly, therefore, do all those whose unspoiled affections and cultivated conscience will not let them rest in a bald Positivism, turn with anxious eyes to the Revealed DOCTRINES of the Church, to see if there be in them those higher truths without which men cannot live.

And so again, amid the present growth of political and personal liberty, how many men there are who feel the need of some—not compulsory, but voluntary—law under which they may regulate their lives! How

[5] Kant, *Kritik of Pure Reason*, p. 390 (Bohn).—'By the development of true celestial mechanics since Newton, all theological philosophy lost for ever its principal intellectual function,—the most regular order being thenceforth conceived as *necessarily* established and maintained in our world.' (Comte, ap. Lewes, *Phil. of the Sciences*, p. 88.)—'Les lois de la Nature sont l'expression la plus rigoureuse de la *nécessité:* mais la nécessité exclut la création: donc ce n'est pas au moyen des lois de la Nature, qu'on peut comprendre le Créateur.' (Moleschott, *Circulation de la Vie*, i. 6, French trans.)—True: the fact being, that Nature is an open secret, full of oracles φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν, fruitful in parables and suggestions, to those otherwise instructed and who 'have ears to hear.' In this sense, it is correct to say, that 'Nature is the great Parable; and the truths which she holds within her are veiled, but not dismembered.. Long before we have searched out all that the Natural includes, there will remain little in the so-called Supernatural which will seem hard of acceptance or belief.' (Duke of Argyll, *Reign of Law*, p. 52.)

many, therefore, are coming to crave the easy yoke of the Church's DISCIPLINE; and are desiring to frame and order their daily occupations in harmony (if the clergy will only provide the opportunity) with the simple routine marked out for us in the Prayer-book.

And yet once more, as every day the dawn of a more imaginative epoch is becoming assured, and the long reign of prose in this country is drawing to an end, so with more interest and craving of the heart do men begin to look around them for some means of honourably gratifying these awakening instincts. And here they find those means prepared for them,—not in the selfish accumulation of art-treasures, not in the private and personal cultivation of æsthetic refinement, —but in the public, common, unselfish, nay, religious and self-forgetting, Services and RITUAL of the Church. Thus we may rest tranquilly assured that, —whatever be the threatening appearances of many things around us and within,—the circumstances of the day, on the whole, are immensely in the Church's favour; and her continuance in this land is almost positively assured, if only her own sons be true to their cause, and will intelligently *study*, *explain*, and *adapt* her system, according to the needs of England at the present time.

And that the opportunity for carrying into effect these plans is certainly approaching, there is another indication of a more subtle historical character, which should not perhaps be overlooked. Obviously, Discipline, Ritual and Doctrine, form the three main departments of ecclesiastical activity. And (as we have already seen in the course of these Lectures), this very classification of subjects in dispute meets us—even where we had not expected it—in studying the history

of Nonconformity in this country. The secessions of the sixteenth century went off mainly on points of discipline; the secessions of the seventeenth century, mainly on points of ritual; those of the eighteenth century, mainly on points of doctrine. And if so, must there not probably be some *law*, which governs this progression of controversial phenomena; especially, if the same phenomena are observable amid the controversies of very different times and very distant countries?

The 'law' that we are in search of is neither very far to seek, nor very recondite when found. It is simply this: that the most obvious and natural occasions for controversy to spring up, and those most readily suggestive of partizanship, are matters affecting our merely external and social arrangements. Hence it arises that questions of polity and *discipline* will be very likely to form the earliest occasion for ecclesiastical dissension. When however controversies of this class have been arranged,—or have (it may be) attained a sort of recognition, as standing and acknowledged topics of dispute,—then there will emerge a new series of more interior questions, affecting the use or disuse of symbols and other 'sacramenta,' by which inward things find outward expression. And so controversy reaches inevitably a second, or *ritual*, stage. Until at last—such discords becoming effete and palpably contemptible—a still farther advance is made into the interior agencies of the Church's life. Her functions as a divinely-commissioned educating society become matters of dispute. And so the spirit of controversy loses its force at length, and dies out amid the hopeless mazes of *doctrinal* polemics. And then — when of this too men become weary and satiated — the cycle of dissension seems to

be, at last, complete. The moral and spiritual verities of unity, peace, and brotherly love, begin to appear, after all, as the only things really worth contending for; and harmony, κόσμος, mutual co-operation, dawn upon men's hearts as a far better and more enduring happiness, than all the stormy joys of disputation.

Now, whatever period of the Church's history we examine, this law of controversial progression seems always —with greater or less degrees of distinctness—to reappear. Take, for instance, the disputes which raged even within the sacred precincts of the early Church. It was on the very morrow of Pentecost itself, that the history of Christian polemics began. And the opening question was (what may be called) the 'Diaconate' question,—a matter concerned entirely with Church-order and exterior discipline. But this first prelude of misunderstanding between the Hebrew and Hellenic, the Asiatic and the European, forms of Christianity, was soon succeeded by a far more flagrant and bitter warfare on the ritual question of circumcision or non-circumcision. And this again was ere long followed by the far deeper and subtler doctrinal problems raised by the Gnostic and Ebionite heresies.

The same 'progression' was repeated, on a larger scale, in the second century. Amid the Eastern Churches of Asia Minor, we first behold St. John and Ignatius contending for Episcopal organization. We next pass on to ritual discussions about the time of keeping Easter, and about the Quakerism of Montanus in Phrygia. And we end with the dangerous doctrinal subtleties and speculations of Origen. Meanwhile, in the West the same cycle meets us once more. Cyprian here, with his Episcopal and Metropolitan difficulties, begins the series. The controversy about re-

baptism, and similar questions, soon follow. And then the whole Church, on the grand scale, plunges into the fearful doctrinal storms of the fourth century, relating to the Incarnation.

And so—passing over the whole intervening period—it was, yet once more, in our own Reformation controversies in England. First arose the exterior questions concerning polity and discipline,—Papal autocracy, Anglican constitutionalism, and Puritan democracy, contending together for the management of the Church. Then followed questions about adult-baptism, about immersion, and similar matters; with their natural result, an uncompromising anti-ritual Quakerism. Lastly, in the eighteenth century, we see Deism and Unitarianism propounding their philosophic subtleties to the upper classes; while, at the opposite pole of the social scale, Methodism inculcated on the unlearned the almost sensuous doctrine of the 'new-birth,' with all its speculative results.

But if this be so, if this be really the law of controversial progression, then at the present hour we have reason indeed to look up and take courage. For the cycle of these miserable and distracting disputes must, in that case, be once more—in this very day of ours—drawing to a close. And a happier period may be near its dawning, when—for some short time, at least,—the voice of Christian good-sense and charity may find opportunity to be heard; when the intrinsic charms of unity and peace may, for a little while, smite men's hearts with yearning; and when a temporary rift among the storm-clouds of contention may reveal, for a little space, the clear calm shining of those eternal verities of a moral and spiritual sort, which no terrestrial disturbance can ever really shake, and which (when

once they reach us) declare, as no other things can, the glories of God on high and the beauty of His Law revealed here below among mankind.

And accordingly, not in the Church alone, but everywhere — even among the rival Dissenting communions—we hear the same note of friendliness and peace. I open at hazard the pages of a Wesleyan Magazine, and there I find these words: 'There are everywhere just now, among the different sections of the Christian Church, yearnings after Christian UNION. In England, Scotland, Australia, and America, different sections of Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, are seeking closer fellowship[6].'—I open the *Congregational Year-Book* for 1871, and I read thus in the President's address: 'There is nothing on which our Lord lays more stress, than the one-ness of His people . . God forbid, when in so many quarters there is a yearning cry for UNITY in the presence of a common foe, we Independents should not be the first to say, "Grace be with all them that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity[7]."' —In a book written some time ago by Mr. Binney, we are told: 'I am as tired as any man of mere sect life; of this and the other portion of the body becoming a separated limb[8].'—In a private letter from a Quaker, the other day, I read: 'The dear blood-bought children of the great universal Father will, in the end, be gathered into one fold, having one Shepherd. Until then, I wish we could have more love, and less doctrine.'—And in a book published by Mr. Miall, in 1850, we are taught as follows: 'It would seem as though the whole business of men here below was to combine in order to render

[6] *Methodist New Connexion Magazine*, April, 1870, p. 24.

[7] *Congregational Year-book*, 1871, p. 68.

[8] Binney, *Church Life in Australia*, p. 112.

combination impossible . . A lap full of blessings—blessings pressed down and heaped up and running over—to that man, whosoever he be, that succeeds in healing a social division[9]!'

In such wishes and prognostications as these, surely every Churchman will most heartily concur. But then, he will think, it is not enough merely to indulge in beautiful wishes and sentiments: we must also go the right way to bring them to a happy result. And that right way, in our own case at least,—for with the duties of other people we are not concerned,—a very little reflection will make clear.

(1.) First of all, our plain and bounden duty, as Churchmen, is to make a candid and honourable confession of past errors and sins, in our method of managing controversies and in the relations we have assumed towards Dissent. To err is human. And the Church of England—as a mere single member of the great Catholic Body of Christ—has never claimed immunity from error or failed distinctly to repudiate Infallibility. And as there is no doubt, I suppose, that she erred under the guidance of the Popes in the Middle Ages, so she erred under the guidance of Cranmer and others at the Reformation; erred again, as she was being drawn into the terrible vortex of the Great Rebellion; succumbed to the great temptations of the Restoration period; and has not since been secured—mainly through timidity and want of statesmanship—from committing some very serious mistakes in our own day.

The error and the sin, in most of these cases, lay in making a high-handed attempt to carry the natural and normal alliance between Church and State to too close a

[9] Miall, *The Voluntary Principle*, p. 126.

degree of intimacy. The Church undertook, by ecclesiastical means, to forward the intentions of the State: and the State, in return, lent her own coërcive powers to the Church, for the delusive purpose of thereby propagating religion. The reparation to be made for all such past mistakes is clear. There is no necessity for a coarse and unskilful severance of all the ties of *alliance* and mutual control, which for ages have bound together, with such good results, the State and the Church in England. But there is need that we acknowledge, heartily and ungrudgingly, the present full political citizenship of all Englishmen alike; that we determine to leave no wrong unredressed, no artificial restriction unabated, no civil or religious disability unrepealed; and even more than this, that we resolve to heal, as far as possible, every *social* wound and to admit, with courteous welcome, the right of each man to his place upon the common platform of our national life[10].

[10] There is no doubt that leading Dissenters deceive themselves a good deal, as to the causes which give rise to their very strong feeling of jealousy against the Church. If a certain section of the middle-classes, already too much isolated from those above and below them, deepen those unhappy lines of demarcation by their own exclusive ecclesiastical arrangements, surely the cause of isolation is partly in themselves and partly in the very nature of English society. Still, God forbid that we should not, in all brotherly kindness, do our best to meet such a challenge as the following: 'You have placed a rival system in the front rank . . Place us on a level. Throw open the prizes of your Universities to our youth . . let us out of the shade into the free air and sunlight: and, if we then fail in culture and power, we fail to our shame.' (Baldwin Brown, *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1871, p. 308.)—'Non-conformists suffer little now from bad laws . . But let not our episcopalian neighbours account it strange, if there are still signs of discontent among us. The many forms of *social* disparagement, disownment, and wrong to which non-conformists are exposed as such, it would require large space to describe . . . Were the episcopalian Church in England a free and self-sustained church, the motive to this policy would cease, and the policy would come to an end.' (Vaughan, *Engl. Nonconformity*, p. 472.) But then, 'how is it that Nonconformists hold aloof from the Church in all our Colonies, *where the last remnant of Establishment has faded?*' (Bishop of Tasmania, in *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1872, p. 156.)

There is no reason whatever why such courtesy and fairness should not be coupled, on the part of Churchmen, with the most profound conviction of the truth of their own cause. Indeed it is precisely the part of firm and strong conviction to be conciliatory and flexible. Where there is life there is elasticity. It is death or coma, which is rigid and cannot yield. While therefore the Churchman will allow the fullest right to every dissenting politician to bring forward in Parliament and to support—by all truthful and honest means—his own views of what is good for the country, it does not at all follow that he will not, with more firmness than ever, maintain both the hopeless imbecility of all schemes for a loose Evangelical Alliance[11]; and also the perilous idealism of all attempts to *identify* the Church with the State[12]. In that identification, religion would disappear; and its mechanism alone would be left behind. The Church does not hold, and never has held, her commission from the State. The State can do no more, than give free course to her beneficent endeavours throughout

[11] The 'Evangelical Alliance' was first started in London, in 1846. It held a second gathering there in 1851. It next met in Paris, in 1855; then at Berlin, 1857; then at Geneva, 1861; and lastly at Amsterdam, 1867. (See Krummacher's *Autobiography*, p. 272.)

[12] In this opinion, which I have not lightly formed, I find myself most unwillingly at issue with one, whose unwearied efforts to draw closer every bond of mutual good will and Christian love, no man who 'knows what spirit he is of' can fail to admire and honour. But it seems to me impossible,—after a long experience of what earnest men (especially young men), of the most varied antecedents and character, really feel on this question,—to think with Dean Stanley that an *identification* of the Church with the State could be effected in practice, however noble and beautiful the theory may be. Occasions have arisen—and may arise again—when the Church, if she is to be faithful to her Master, must rebuke and oppose the State. And this she can do with the most powerful effect, if she is in close *alliance* with the State; but she can not do, if her personality (as it were) is absorbed and *blended* with that of the State.—Short of this one divergence, I am sanguine enough to hope that the attempt made in these Lectures to 'prove all things, and hold fast that which is good,' will not miss the sympathy of the greatest master of ecclesiastical history which this country possesses.

the land, take care that her endowments be properly distributed, and protect from every form of injustice both Churchmen in their relations to each other, and non-Churchmen in their dealings with the Church. But mission to teach,—this the Church of Jesus Christ, the *ecclesia docens*, never has received, and surely never can receive, from any but from her Lord and Master and from His immediate Apostles. And any assumption by the State of greater powers than properly belong to it, she cannot in duty shrink from rebuking as a failure of justice, and a breach of the terms of mutual alliance.

But such a breach, it must be remembered, the State has not in our day committed. In every one of the appeals to her Majesty's Privy Council, of which we have heard so much lately, the matter under discussion was simply the true legal bearing of a legal document (or 'canon') of the Church. And the appeal was carried up to the Crown, in the last resort,—as the fountain-head of justice to all Englishmen,—by a subject of the realm, who conceived (rightly or wrongly) that he had suffered injury by the misconstruction of a certain canon. Precisely in the same way, Presbyterians at the Cape have appealed to the Queen in Council, and Wesleyans or Baptists at home might appeal,—if they felt themselves aggrieved by any misconstruction of the bye-laws of their respective Denominations. Roman Catholics too may, at any moment, find themselves unexpectedly subject to the same 'supremacy of the crown in all causes,' if any such conflict should break out on the novel doctrine of Infallibility, as has already broken out in Germany and France[13].

[13] The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is nothing more, or less, than *the independent Sovereignty of the Nation*, in exercise upon a certain class of cases. This independence has *never* really been surrendered,

Disestablishment, therefore, would not make the slightest difference in this respect, either to Churchmen or to anybody else. It might give the Church more freedom for interior *legislation*, and offer facilities for the multiplication of canons, such as perhaps few of us would really desire to be entangled with. But the *judicial* system of the Church would remain very much as it is at present. And it does seem to be the very highest pinnacle of folly, to lose sight—amid the dust and clamour of mere party disputes—of that grand principle, which the best men in the Church and State of England have, for six centuries, been firmly and courageously maintaining; viz. the principle of *government by fixed laws*, and not by the mere will and pleasure of any man or set of men,—government by known and established rules, and not by the swaying impulses of a Congregationalist majority, nor yet by the *ipse dixit* of an Infallible Pope.

If that be not, in few words, the grand object and purpose of the Church's bitter sufferings and perplexities in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it would be very hard to say what their purpose was. But, for that object, that only polity in the world which deserves the honoured name of 'freedom,' it was well worth while to suffer martyrdom, and even to run the risk of a temporary confusion of all order and loss of Catholic discipline. For Constitutional government is a blessing,

---

even in the worst times of usurped Papal supremacy; and its normal executive form has always been that of 'the Crown in Council.'—'The essential peculiarity of the Privy Council is . . the indefiniteness of its constitution. Being not an organized body, but simply an assemblage of all the advisers of the King, it has at no time acted in collective union. Many of our institutions,—such, for instance, as the Court of Chancery and the ordinary Law Courts,—were historically committees of the Council . . and the Privy Council has always acted through committees.' (Brodrick and Fremantle, *Judgments of Privy Council*, p. lxv.)

which brings all other blessings in its train. It offers opportunity for every error and neglect to be amended. It gives an opening for the individual conscience and reason to gain a hearing. It enables fresh truth to win its way gradually to the front. And it permits elasticity of adaptation, to meet the varying emergencies of successive epochs.

Indeed, the Reformation itself, and the long struggles which preceded it, were one consistent warfare against (what may be called) 'the voluntary principle,'—that is to say, the principle of arbitrary government by men's mere *will and pleasure*. The 'tyranny of majorities' had not, of course, in those days been invented. It was ecclesiastical despotism, 'the tyranny of the Papacy,'—purporting to override all law, tradition, custom, protest,—against which men's efforts were at that time directed. And no sooner was that tyranny introduced—with other novelties—at the Conquest, than our country began at once (with varying degrees of consistency) to assume the attitude of resistance which she has ever since maintained. The Conqueror himself was strong enough to keep the mischief at bay; and to answer to the blandishments of Pope Gregory VII, 'Fidelitatem facere nolui; nec volo: quià nec ego promisi, nec antecessores meos antecessoribus tuis id fecisse comperio[14].' But subsequent kings of England,—with their insecure titles to the crown, and with the perilous possibilities of insurrection and chaos, such as had befallen the German Empire before their eyes,—too often gave an opening for this ever-watchful foe to interfere. And at last, when Becket's martyrdom had enlisted the popular enthusiasm on the papal side, King John was forced to succumb ignominiously and

[14] Greg. VII. *Epistolæ*, p. 748 (ed. Migne).

completely; and then for 300 years—and for that period alone, through the whole course of our history—Popery may be said, on the whole, to have had the advantage, in the ceaseless struggle between the old Catholic freedom and the new Papal absolutism.

For even throughout those Middle Ages, which might be claimed as affording precedent to those, who would wish to see the Church 'liberated from State control,' the determination of our country to resist such measures was unmistakably proclaimed. So early as 1135, Henry I. forbade the introduction of the Pope's Decretals into England. In 1187, we hear the claim advanced, which afterwards in Henry the Eighth's reign became the watchword of the Reformation, viz. that England was no part of the Holy Roman Empire, and owed no canonical obedience to the ecclesiastical head of that Empire. 'Dicitur etiam per totam Angliam, quòd ibi velit Archiepiscopus *Patriarchatum* fieri: cum jam nihil literis Domini Papæ, vel appellationibus, deferat[15].' In the same reign—Becket himself, as Chancellor, energetically supporting the king—the following language was addressed to the Bishop of Chichester:—'Tu, pro papæ auctoritate *ab hominibus concessâ*, contrà dignitatum regalium auctoritates mihi à Deo concessas calliditate argutâ, niti præcogitas[16].' In 1236, the State—loudly protesting, at Merton, against the intrusion of Papal government by *will* and pleasure—declared 'nolumus *leges* Angliæ mutari[17].' In 1253, Bishop Grostête refused point-blank to receive ecclesiastical appointments, made by the Pope in contravention of the Church's *laws*[18]. In 1279, Parliament began in

[15] Stubbs, *Richard I.*, p. xxxviii. 105.
[16] Brodrick, *Privy Council*, p. xxvii. [18] *Ibid.* p. 109: Luard, *Grostête*.
[17] Robins, *Royal Supremacy*, p. p. 432.

earnest to 'protest,' in the form of statutes of the realm, against Papal lawlessness. And so at last, in 1536, Archbishop Cranmer—standing at Christ Church, at the mercy of his enemies, and following the example first set by some Cardinals at Rome in 1297[19], and in later times by Chicheley[20], Luther[21], Erasmus[22], Melancthon[23], Archbishop Hermann, and the Augsburg Confession[24],—uttered his memorable appeal, from the personal autocracy of the Pope, to the 'next General Council[25].' And this 'protest' the Church of England

---

[19] 'The two Cardinals of the [Colonna] family published a protest against Boniface VIII, and his proceedings . . They appealed to a General Council . . Thus we see, first called forth by the wicked acts of this pope, an appeal to the higher tribunal: . . an appeal which for the present indeed met with no response; but is worthy of notice, as the first impulse towards calling into action a power . . so dangerous to papal absolutism.' (Neander, *Church Hist.*, ix. 5 [Bohn],—quoting Raynaldi Annales, A.D. 1297.)

[20] Archbishop Chicheley thus appealed against Pope Martin V, 1427; . . 'Unde ego, . . sentiens me, statum, dignitatem, et Ecclesiam meam, nimium prægravari . . , ad Sacrosanctum Concilium Generale, universalem Ecclesiam representans . . appello.' (Burnet, *Reformation*, iv. 384, small edit.)

[21] Luther, *Opera Lat.*, i. 205, (ap. Schröck, K. G. seit der Ref., i. 166: 'Er appellirte, am 28 Nov. 1518, in der Kapelle des Leibes Christi zu Wittenberg, von dem Papste an einen höhern Richter,—an eine allgemeine Kirchenversammlung.') Cf. Hardwick, *Reform.*, p. 28.

[22] Erasmus, *Epist.*, lib. xxviii. Ep. 8, [1522]: 'Multa problemata nunc rejiciuntur ad Synodum *οἰκουμενικήν*.'

[23] 'Melancthon and his friends affirmed, in 1530, that with regard to most of the disputed points they acted but provisionally. Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne — whose "Consultation" was the work of the same moderate school, looked hopefully as late as 1543 to some Conciliar reformation: "which things we set forth to be received . . until a general reformation be made, by a free and Christian Council, universal or national."' (Hardwick, *Reform.*, p. 9.)—In 1538, the Convocation of Canterbury put forth a 'Judgment concerning General Councils,' signed by all the Bishops but two; in which they affirm, 'there never was anything devised by our forefathers, more expedient . . for the reduction of Christ's people into one perfect unity and concord in His religion, than by the having of General Councils.' (Burnet, *Reform.*, ii. 198, small edit.)

[24] *Augsburg Confession* [1530], præf. p. 10 (ed. Maerkel): 'Ad cujus etiam Generalis Concilii conventum, in hâc longè maximâ et gravissimâ causâ, . . provocavimus et appellavimus.'

[25] 'On the 14th of February, 1556, the Archbishop was brought under a guard to Christ Church. Here the

has ever since maintained. May she ever maintain it, in tenacious loyalty to freedom and truth, until such happy time shall dawn, when it shall be no longer needed!

But that time certainly has not yet come. Dead controversies appear to be, in many varied shapes, reviving again. And the partizans, it seems, on more sides than one, of a false, a personal, a 'voluntary' system, have once more to be silenced by those who have learnt, amid the glorious struggles of our country's political history, what true freedom is like, and how it is to be maintained. Meanwhile let but the real conditions of the ecclesiastical problem now before us be fairly *understood* by the English people, and there cannot be the shadow of a doubt as to the result. Two distinct epochs, providentially, can be pointed out—even since the Reformation—when the two false systems of Church polity, now once more pressed upon us, gained the ascendant and showed decisively what they were each worth, and what they would each do, if they had the power. The first was the epoch of the five years' Romanist reaction, under Queen Mary: the second was the eleven years of Presbyterian and Independent ascendancy, under the Commonwealth. It seems incredible that our countrymen, in the nineteenth century, should seriously wish to revert to either of those two periods. The Church of England, in any case, would no

---

Bishop of London [Bonner], the Bishop of Ely [Thirlby], and other persons in the commission, had already taken their places on an elevated platform before the high altar. The commission was read . . The procession moved out of the Church to a portion of the adjoining yard. Here stood a credence-table in the shape of an altar . . . Then the voice of the Archbishop was heard once more. Drawing from his sleeve a document hitherto concealed, "I appeal," he said, "to the next General Council." ' (Hook, *Archbishops*, vii. 385: cf. Burnet, *Reform.* iii. 426.)

more be destroyed by such experiments, than it was before. But if, on the contrary, Englishmen recoil from both these extreme courses,—then, let them remember, they have already in their midst a Church, which in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries firmly resisted both extremes; and which is now prepared to put forth all her latent force, and to use her wide-spread organization, to resist them again. And they might do well to reflect, whether the honourable maintenance of a National Church, thus pledged to loyal and English courses, be not among the most important guarantees which any State can secure, for keeping at safe distance, not one only, but both of these great perils of 'voluntaryism.'

(2.) Passing then to the second, or ritual, class of controversies: in these again our Church's present duty, as illustrated for her by the events of the seventeenth century, is clear. She is bound to confess to the Baptist, that she has been guilty of negligence, both in allowing the sacraments instituted by our Lord to fall too much into desuetude and dishonour; and also in despairing too much of keeping up interior discipline, the means whereof is partly placed in her hands by the rite of Confirmation. That rite, carefully dispensed, and the rite of Ordination, carefully guarded, supply precisely that testing and disciplinary agency, which the Baptist wrongly seeks in re-baptism; and without which, no doubt, laxity and worldliness might creep in and overspread the whole Church with secularity. But on the other hand, any attempt to bind us hand and foot to such ritual alone as happens to be mentioned on the page of Scripture, must be by every Churchman strenuously resisted. Ritual freedom must be maintained at all hazards. The theory of Hooker—which is that of the English Church—must be resolutely defended; viz.

that, all such secondary matters being in themselves things indifferent, demand of us conformity, and not non-conformity, obedience, and not disobedience, to lawful authority. 'Conscientious objections' cannot possibly have any place, where no duty exists,—except only that duty, that debt always outstanding, 'to love one another' and to 'do all things without murmurings and disputings.' The Ritual canons of the Church, therefore, whatever they may be,—drawn up by the Church herself as laws to guide her people, and interpreted by the best 'legal' authorities this country possesses—should be cheerfully obeyed by us; however strenuously meantime we may endeavour to have them improved.

And as to falling into any error like that of the Baptists, in threatening or accomplishing 'secession,' in case our own views of these things should not at once gain acceptance, such a course (surely) would be inconsistent with the very first principles of Churchmanship. *A loyalty which can be reconsidered is no loyalty at all.* But a loyalty, which can suffer, which can forego many longed-for things, and to avoid offending weaker brethren can bear to miss from their accustomed place '*antiqua* nomina antiquam fidem significantia,' because fidelity perhaps demands '*nova* nomina' more suitable to modern ears,—such a loyalty is sound, living, and trustworthy [26]. And it is such a liegeman alone, that

[26] Churchmen will probably one day come to see, how infinitely less important is the question, whether a certain 'psalm, *Quicunque vult*,' shall be sung at popular services or retained as a standard for the clergy, than the question whether Christ does not demand of us to remove (at some cost to our own feelings) all σκάνδαλα which may cause our brother to stumble or offend. Σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις; κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔχε, ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ! (*Rom.* xiv. 22; 1 *Cor.* viii. 11.) The Apostles' Creed is that which we confessed at our baptism, and are at all times ready, in baptismal attitude, to confess again. The Eucharistic creed we

has firm ground beneath his feet in rebuking the narrow scruples of the Baptist; or in recovering the Quaker from a bald spiritualism, which has learnt to despair of all the Church's ceremonial system, owing to its apparent inability to adapt itself to the needs of modern times.

(3.) And yet once more,—to the Unitarians and Wesleyans of the eighteenth century, the Church of England has her acknowledgments to make; acknowledgments of hard words used and unconciliatory measures adopted[27]. Rationalism and mysticism, no doubt, are very potent and dangerous elements in the Church's life. But elements in that life they certainly are. And, under any 'Catholicity' worthy of the name, they would be made to balance and supplement each other; rendering progress—scientific and devotional—at once possible and safe. But if, with rash and strange

use 'as a hymn-like ascription to God of His own redeeming work, no less than as an expression of belief in it.' (Freeman, *Principles of Div. Serv.* ii. 451.) But the Athanasian Creed, a mere Latin formula of unknown authorship in the eighth century, is far more suitable to an honoured position as a standard of orthodoxy beside the Thirty-nine Articles, than to a place where 'most of the essential words are understood by the common people in a sense very different from their original intention, . . while they are enforced under anathemas the most terrible and plain that human language admits.' (Stanley, *Athanasian Creed*, p. 35.)—'I protest against the compulsory use of the Athanasian Creed, as not only an evil on account of the effect it produces on many of the most intelligent and attached members of our Church, but a wrong in itself.' (Bishop Thirlwall, *Report of Royal Commission*, p. x.)

[27] No doubt, hard words have been used in all these controversies on both sides. But manly and intelligent Dissenters are beginning to be ashamed of their endless, and often baseless, complaints against the injustice of past times; and one has been found lately bold enough to proclaim the truth: that 'it was emphatically due to members of the Church of England, that the last penal statute against freedom of religious worship received its overthrow... Congregationalists and Baptists—the immediate progenitors of the Liberation Society—at the best were lukewarm; no fervour of liberation seized them, though their fellow-Dissenters of an unpopular faith might be outlawed and imprisoned.' (Green, *Dissenters and the Established Church*, p. 14, 1871.)

timidity, we try to arrest Reason on its path of inquiry, instead of skilfully bending its wild useless flight into an orbit obedient to the great Sun of Righteousness, we shall find that success in this attempt will be (if possible) more disastrous to the best interests of the Church, than even a helpless and public failure would be. For secret or open infidelity will begin to honeycomb the English Church, as it has already undermined so many foreign churches that remain under the direction of Rome. And spiritualism, revivalism, mysticism, and religious hysteria, will quickly take their revenge; by throwing good sense away, and giving rein to some of the fiercest and most irrational emotions of human nature.

On the other side, feelings coldly neglected, mysticism taken no account of, plainness and common-sense made the absolute rule by which all things shall be squared,—this course too prepares for any religious community a sad and hopeless decline. The great mass of mankind need to be strongly stirred. And it is their *feelings*, and not their reason, which offer themselves as the conducting point on which the fire of God shall descend. What note of failure could more plainly condemn any Christian Church, than the failure to draw in those very classes to whom the Saviour announced that His Gospel should be preached, and to whom He Himself dedicated the very opening words of His first Sermon on the Mount,—'Blessed are ye poor!' As therefore Wesleyanism—in its present condition—is a standing warning to the Church, against fanning overmuch the flame of mere feeling and sensational excitement, a flame which too often ends with becoming master instead of servant in the household, and causing schisms instead of order, peace, and mutual aid: so also Unitarianism

should warn us all against imagining that bare, impersonal truth is ever acceptable to mankind, or exercises any spell upon their moral nature[28]. For Plato is most certainly wrong, when he says that knowledge and virtue are convertible terms. And it is not by Reason that a man is justified and made a new creature,—but by Faith.

But here I hasten to say once more,—what, indeed, I have said, without fear of contradiction, throughout the course of these Lectures,—viz. that it has not been *warning* merely, or the safety that comes of repulsion, that our Church has gained from the various Dissenting bodies that surround her. Owen and Baxter, among the Independents and Presbyterians; Cardinal Pole and Sir Thomas More, among the Romanists; Robert Hall, among the Baptists; George Fox and Penn, among the Quakers; Lardner and Channing, among the Unitarians; and Wesley himself, among the Wesleyans; these names, of themselves,—not to mention many living men, for whom no one can fail to entertain the deepest respect,—are enough to suggest, that the Church of England owes many obligations and has learnt many valuable lessons, from the religious communions which have seceded from her. They have been to her like the satellites thrown off from some great central planet. And,—not only by catching and reflecting certain rays of light which she had missed, but also by presenting to her the deeply interesting spectacle of their various phases, and of their behaviour amid the complicated

[28] 'Nicht logische Begriffe, sondern geschichtliche ideale Gestalten erfüllen das Leben der Menschen, erfüllen die Weltgeschichte, sind die Triebkraft der Völker-entwickelung. Nicht als logischer Satz, sondern als Gestalt tritt die Wahrheit auf.' (*Europa*, No. 27, p. 776.)

influences of modern life,—they have greatly contributed to her instruction. How else could she have learnt so well, what Christianity under modern conditions is capable of? How else could she have seen, what forms of polity and modes of action are likely either to fail or to succeed? How could certainty have been attained so easily, as to the ultimate mischief which often flows from an apparently small and harmless deviation from the established traditions of the Church, or which accompanies the unguarded preaching of some fair-seeming, but one-sided, truth [29]?

Above all, how else could the Church have learnt so well the enormous and (by the utmost human skill) incurable evils, that accrue from the 'childish' and 'carnal' spirit of διχοστασία, of partizanship, of schism? For, explain and pare away the meaning of that unwelcome word, as much as you please,—still the thing, the spirit, the *temper*, which it expresses remains [30]. And, if the New Testament is true, it is an 'evil spirit,' working in our fallen hearts in opposition to the Spirit of Christ; and is as contrary to all the teachings of the Gospel, as jealousy and hate are contrary to love. He therefore that thinks lightly, or speaks lightly, of separation from his brethren—be the cause, in his (surely fallible) judgment,

[29] It is surprising that thoughtful Dissenters do not see, that it is simple common sense which induces the Church to protect her people, by placing the main barrier of her Discipline *at entrance into Holy Orders*, rather than at entrance into the Church. 'Up in Notting Hill is a Tabernacle, built up and carried on by a Mr. Varley, an humble imitator of Mr. Spurgeon. Originally Mr. Varley was a butcher: but he took to preaching; and finding that people came to hear him, and that he did them good, he now devotes himself entirely to ministerial work. At his Tabernacle, in S. James's Square, there is accommodation for 1200 hearers; and for the education of more than 500 children.' (Ritchie, *Religious Life of London*, p. 168.)

[30] 'Schismatici dissensionibus iniquis à *fraternâ caritate* dissiliunt, quamvis ea credant quæ credimus.' (Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo*, § 10.)

as serious as it may—must have 'learnt nothing and forgotten nothing,' since the great revolution of the sixteenth century[31]. Manly courses, such as *lead other people for a time to separate from him*, are often the duty of a Christian. Such courses are plainly the duty of the German Catholics at this moment; precisely as they were the duty of English Catholics 300 years ago. But to 'protest' is one thing: to 'secede,' or threaten secession, is another. And worst of all were it, to rejoice in secession, to maintain it as a chronic and desirable thing, and to formulate delusive schemes and theories[32], whereby to perpetuate for ever that which ought to have been only a sharp remedial crisis, with inherent tendency to reversion and to the recovery of organic unity once more.

Thanks be to God, therefore, that the Church of England presents at this moment—as she has repeatedly done, during the long period of her chequered history—the aspect of a friend sincerely and anxiously desirous to be reconciled to those who have separated from her. Without exaggerating the simple truth of the matter, and without dissembling that there is not in all Church-

---

[31] Δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν
Μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει τὸ μέλλον.
(Æschylus, *Agam.*, 249.)

[32] 'We turn to gaze upon another vision, fairer, nobler, more fruitful by far, which would realize our aspirations for the religious future of our land. The country full of a zealous and independent ministry of the Gospel, . . each community working out, in entire freedom, its conception of what a Church ought to be, and ought to do; under the guidance of a minister ordained for its service by the manifest unction of the Spirit.' (*Britisb Quarterly Magazine*, July 1871, p. 154.)—'The only adequate conception of a Christian State, is that of a nation whose whole life is saturated with Christian ideas and influences; and which gives free play to its religious beliefs and impulses, that (like the higher intellectual life of the people) they may express themselves as they see fit.' (*Contemporary Review*, January 1871, p. 306.)

men this spirit,—still on the whole it is beyond dispute, that the attitude of our Church to most of the denominations in this country is now distinctly conciliatory; and that, with a little more mutual understanding, this tendency to reunion might be almost indefinitely accelerated. There is no disinclination, on our part, to adopt from Dissenters (with the fullest acknowledgements) whatever they have of good and sound and useful. Nor has any one of the more important denominations the slightest necessity, on returning to the Church, to give up one single truth that God has taught them; to deny or turn their backs upon one single good work which they have already done, and which God has in many cases signally blest; nor yet to disparage by one breath of contempt, or one word of dispraise, any gifted or saintly personage, who (as we believe) under misapprehension of what the Church's real meaning was, contended against her and sought to preach Christ by other methods than hers.

On the contrary, every such denomination has—as I have attempted to show in these Lectures—a banner and a camping-ground of its own, within the broad area of the Church of England. And the language that every intelligent Churchman should hold towards those who seek reunion, is but a repetition of what the great Augustine said, 1400 years ago: 'Quemadmodum Judæus cùm ad nos venerit, ut Christianus fiat, non in eo destruimus bona Dei, sed mala ipsius; . . sicut credebat credenda, sicut tenebat tenenda, firmamus; ita etiam cùm ad nos venit schismaticus vel hæreticus, ut Catholicus fiat,—schisma ejus et hæresim dissuadendo et destruendo rescindimus; sacramenta verò Christiana (si eadem in illo invenimus) et *quidquid aliud veri tenet,*

*absit ut violemus!* absit ut, si semel data novimus, iteremus[33]!'

But, on the other hand, amid all these words of welcome and reconciliation, it were sheer folly to expect the Church of England to abandon the very principle of visible and organic unity, on which her own existence is grounded; or to affect surprise that she will not strike her flag, and disown (at others' bidding) her loyalty and faith in that ideal oneness of Christ's Church, which after all sinks far below her Master's own definition,—when He prayed 'that they all may be ONE; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they all may be One in Us, that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me.' No true Churchman pretends to believe, that the decomposition of Christ's kingdom into a multitude of sects is a matter of indifference to Him; that all the multifarious communions around us are of equal value in His eyes; or that (to borrow the language so often heard among our poorer brethren), 'if we get to heaven, it does not matter how we get there.'

Whatever this popular conception of 'getting to heaven' may be worth, one thing is certain: that if our Lord has left on earth an organized and visible society,—in which He has lodged His commission to go and teach all nations, and has stored therein special gifts of the Holy Ghost for the successful fulfilment of that commission,—it may be one, among the unexpected discoveries of the Day of Judgment, that each person may have to answer for himself—'according to that

[33] Augustine, *De Unico Bapt.*, cap. 2, (Migne's edit., vol. ix. 596.) The same thought has struck others also. 'This is the secret of the influence, by which the Church draws to herself converts from such various and conflicting religions. They come, *not to lose what they have*, but to gain what they have not; and in order that, by means of what they have, more may be given to them.' (Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, p. 241.)

which he had, not according to that he had not'—how far he presumed, in his lifetime, to act as though Christ had never left any such society at all. And many a well-seeming and well-meaning man, may have to cry out, at last, 'Lord, when saw we Thee crucified afresh, —and made no sign of disapprobation? When caused we Thy name to be blasphemed among the heathen, and Thine own prayer to be converted into failure—by a self-will and disobedience, which we mistook for doing Thee service? When was thy seamless robe torn into shapeless rents, by our pitiful jealousies, our senseless disputes, our utterly un-Christian self-assertion?' For these things—whether they exist among Churchmen or Dissenters—are not merely errors, but *sins*. 'The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: . . hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies; . . of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God [34].'

And now, to sum up in two words all that has been said,—every loyal son of the Church of England should, in these days, engrave upon his memory and upon his conscience this simple maxim: *Efficiency and unity within, candour and conciliation towards those that are without*,—these would be the certain means of restoring, ere many years are past, the old historical Church to an unchallenged position of dignity and usefulness in this country, such as at no former time she has ever held; and such as no other Church in the whole world has any prospect or any opportunities of holding. Men now-a-days judge practically. They look not to the theories of things, their orthodoxy, their harmony with other truths,

[34] *Gal.* vi. 19.

or their remote logical consequences,—but to their results. And that religious communion will, in the long run, most commend itself to Englishmen, which displays the greatest efficiency in winning souls to Christ; which proves, by a long firm grasp of its spiritual conquests, the stability and force of its methods; which makes men 'men,' and not merely bigots or spiritual invalids; which shows masterly boldness in grappling with that special characteristic of our time, an ever-widening and ever-deepening knowledge of nature; and which has vital power and elasticity enough to adapt itself to all sorts and conditions of men, and to the ever-varying necessities of our modern life.

Lastly, in all our relations to Dissenters, let past evil methods be forgotten and banished clean out of mind, and that ever old, yet ever new commandment be remembered,—the commandment of peace and love. Explanation,—if it were possible, *mutual* explanation,—let that be the object of our most earnest endeavours! let that be the solvent, which shall relax our hostilities, and perhaps convert our present 'conscientious opponents' into the staunchest and most conscientious supporters of our Church. It does not follow, because *we* are touched and edified by the thousand associations that whisper to us between the lines of our treasured Prayer-book, that speak to us in the sculpture or the glass of our storied cathedrals, or haunt us amid the colleges and religious houses for study at the universities, that these things will come home, without explanation or kindly guidance, to the minds of a practical and prosaic people. They will rather complain—

> 'The living do not rule this world,—ah no!
> It is the dead, the dead[35].'

[35] Ingelow, *Poems*, p. 22.

Thus has lately cried aloud,—with far more terrible impatience and dramatic emphasis than we need ever fear perhaps in this country,—smoking and ruined Paris; with its noble 'past' disconnected and estranged from its restless 'present,' through the incurable breach of 1789; with its failure to interest the industrial masses in the political continuity of the State; and with its ancient Church, now petrified under foreign influence, slavishly re-echoing the eternal 'non possumus' of the papacy, and prevented thereby from adapting itself to modern needs, and from reconciling itself heartily to modern civilization. A truly sad and miserable spectacle! A strange conjunction of extreme political mobility, and extreme ecclesiastical immobility, within the area of a single nation,—such as the world has rarely seen, and such as the intervention of an angel from heaven could hardly save from certain disaster and chaos!

Happily, our own people have not yet come to disbelieve in their past history, or to distrust the loyalty of their National Church in adapting herself to the nation's needs, as times and circumstances vary[36]. They are still proud of their country, and of its ancient institutions. And the number of those sad and earnest men of one idea, without humour, without imagination, who still—with France before their eyes—dream of making all things new by one fiat of the popular will, is a very small minority of the nation. For we may not understand the past, we may forget it, and lavish

[36] 'A nos yeux, l'organisation de l'église Anglicane est abusive . . Mais n'oublions point que l'Angleterre tout entière,—l'Angleterre, non pas en comptant les voix, mais en pésant et en estimant les volontés,—a voulu ce qui est aujourd'hui. En l'établissant, en le maintenant, elle a fait preuve de liberté . . Qu'on s'en fie à la nation Anglaise, et à sa longue expérience!' (Sismondi, *Études sur les Constit.* i. 373.)

no love or thought upon it: but we can no more disconnect the present from it, or pretend to be unaffected by it, than we can pretend to be unaffected by the now forgotten and unimaginable Glacial Epoch,—which furrowed out for us our smiling valleys, and chiselled in rough outline the loved features of our native land.

If therefore we could only make some first step, towards recovering for our Church a truly National extension; if we could only succeed in so small a thing, as in bringing our countrymen together[37] once more, if not for preaching, at least for COMMON WORSHIP; if we could only persuade them of the beauty and the happiness of sinking our mere *opinions*, while uniting in a common Ritual[38] and lifting up our hearts in common Psalmody;—who can say, from such small beginnings, what great results might grow? Who can say, what visions of love and peace might not unfold themselves, as men became accustomed to the harmonies of combined musical effort, and resigned themselves to the educating spell of that, which (in Hooker's words) 'delighteth all ages, and beseemeth all states[39]?' For,

[37] Aristotle (*Polit.* i. 2) long ago remarked, that withdrawal from association with his fellow-men marked a man as either θηρίον ἢ θεός. And late observation shows, in a lunatic asylum, the morbid and abnormal character of ultrà-individualism. 'Each man talked to himself, laughed to himself, and although surrounded by companions took no heed whatever of one of them. Every man appeared thoroughly alone.' (Blanchard Jerrold, *Children of Lutetia*, i. 184.)

[38] 'The Christian philosopher cannot fail to discern, through all the .. bitter contention and conflicting anathemas which assail him, on his way of peace, one sublime and original thought .. This thought is nothing less than that great fundamental idea of the reunion of the mind of mortal man with God, by thankful sacrifice of self, in life—*and therefore also in worship.*' (Bunsen, *Analecta Antenic.*, iii. 4.)

'One sacrifice, I know, in Heaven above more dear
Than smoke of slaughtered oxen; 'tis to offer up
Thine own heart's angry rage, thy own revenge.'
(Bishop Tegner, *Fritbiofsage*, Eng. trans. p. 176.)

[39] Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v. 38. 1.

as St. Basil beautifully reminds us, 'Psalmody makes fair-weather for the soul: psalmody is the arbiter of peace: psalmody is the fast welder of friendship. For who can bring himself to regard any longer as an enemy, one with whom he has lifted up his voice in harmony, in the praise and worship of God[40]?'

But if even this be too much to hope, if we must still—on God's own day of peace and reunion and brotherly love—go apart from one another and 'forsake the assembling of ourselves *together*,' if the divisions of Christendom touch us with no compunction, and the threatening array of vice and unbelief touch us with no fear,—then there is nought else to do, but to hope for, and pray for, and labour for, a return of that great tide of Christian love[41], which may lift us all once more to higher levels, and flood our oozy creeks and separate harbours with the desire and with the means of intercommunion once more. And then we may smile to see, how long and how strangely we misunderstood each other. We may weep to perceive how wicked and unchristian were many things, in which we thought

---

[40] St. Basil, *On the Psalms*, Works, i. 90 (ed. Paris, 1721).

[41] How are all the poets inspired by the thought of 'love's' mighty power to lift man above himself. The profoundest poem in the English language (Tennyson's *In Memoriam*), opens with an address to the 'Strong Son of God, eternal Love!'—An American master of song cries:—

'Ah, how skilful grows the hand
That obeyeth Love's command!
'Tis the heart, and not the brain,
That the highest doth attain.'
(Longfellow, *Building of the Ship*, Works, p. 343.)

And a German, with still more ardent enthusiasm:

'Die Liebe kennt nicht Vaterland;
Sie macht uns alle gleich.
Ein jedes Herz ist ihr verwandt,
Sie macht den Bettler reich.'
(Tieck, *Gedichte*, p. 449)

we were 'doing God service.' And we may determine that no future dissensions shall ever attain the fatal growth which past disputes have attained; or ever hereafter blot from view those golden words of old prophetic inspiration, 'Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren! to dwell together in UNITY.'

# APPENDIX M.

## *The Organization of the Church of England.*

All Christians agree that our Saviour left a 'Church,' of some sort, on earth. What then is that Church? To this question only two answers are possible: (1) *The answer of the Puritan:* that He left a spiritual, godly, and therefore (for the most part) *invisible* brotherhood. For who can really judge the hearts of men, but God alone? Naturally then, such a theory would go on its way independent of—nay, even suspicious of—outward organization; and it would be content to gather into nuclei, or societies, those who (so far as could be seen) had been 'converted' by God's direct agency. (2) *The answer of the Catholic* is quite different. He believes that Christ left on earth an actual, *visible*, and efficient polity; that its members are all those whom His providence brings to the doorway of baptism, and whose guarantees of being in earnest seem sufficient; and its government such as was sketched out, and set in motion, by the Lord Himself and His apostles. And on this theory, it is obvious that 'organization' will form a very important question indeed.

Now there is no doubt that this last is the answer of the Church of England. In no other way is her doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration intelligible; or her discipline pardonable, in demanding that all who wish for the higher sacrament of full membership, in Holy Communion, should first seek the Bishop's confirmation; or her still stricter discipline reasonable, in refusing to hear of self-ordained teachers, or to recognise as presbyters men for whose soundness, ability, and sufficient knowledge, her own officers have never made themselves responsible. What then, more precisely, is the Organization of the Church of England?

I. The Supreme Head *and centre of unity for the Church of England,*—as for all other Churches,—*is Jesus Christ,* seen by the eye of faith, and present with us always 'even to the end of the world.' This is plain, not only from the whole tenor of her teaching, but also from the express confession of Henry the Eighth,—the very person who is popularly accused of usurping Christ's Headship. He writes thus to the Clergy of the Province of York, in 1533: 'Christ is indeed *unicus dominus et supremus;* as we confess Him in the Church daily... It were *nimis absurdum* for us to be called *Caput Ecclesiæ, representans Corpus Christi mysticum:* .. and therefore is added [in the 'Act of Submission'] *et Cleri Anglicani,* which words conjoined restrain,

by way of application, the word *Ecclesiam;* and is as much as to say "the Church,—that is to say, the Clergy,—of England."... So as in all these Acts concerning the persons of priests, their laws, their acts, and order of living, forasmuch as they be indeed all *temporal* and concerning this present life only, in those we (as we be called) be indeed in this realm "Caput;" and because there is no man above us here, "supremum caput." As to spiritual things,.. they have no worldly nor temporal head, but only Christ... And being called "head" of all, we be not in deed—nor in name, to him that would sincerely understand it—head of such things... Ye ought to understand *temporalibus* for the passing over this life in quietness... It were most improperly spoken, to say we be *illius Ecclesiæ caput in temporalibus*, which hath not "temporalia."' (Wilkins, iii. 762.)

The same explanation of the phrase 'supreme head upon earth,' as limited to government and coercive jurisdiction over the *persons* of the clergy, is given by authority under Edward VI: 'Rex, tam in archiepiscopos, episcopos, cleros, et alios ministros, quàm in laicos .. plenissimam jurisdictionem, tam civilem quàm ecclesiasticam, habet et exercere potest: cùm omnis jurisdictio, et ecclesiastica, et secularis, ab eo (tanquam ex uno et eodem fonte) derivatur.' (*Reform. Legum*, p. 200.)

Queen Elizabeth, in her celebrated Injunctions, of 1559, repeats the same thing: 'Her Majesty neither doth, nor ever will, challenge any authority, than that was challenged and lately used by .. King Henry the Eighth and King Edward the Sixth, which is—and was, of ancient time,—due to the imperial crown of this realm: that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, .. so as no other foreign power shall, or ought to, have any superiority over them.' (ap. Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. 200.)

Christ therefore being the Head of the Church, whatever comes from Him—and in proportion as it is capable of being shown to come from Him—is to be received with the most profound attention and submission. Hence the extreme respect paid by the Church of England to the Holy Scriptures,—the work of His *immediate* apostles and prophets.

II. The Legislative Power—according to the theory of the Church of England,—*is lodged in the whole body of the 'fideles' scattered throughout Christendom:* and it is the voice of the whole body, the oracle or 'temple of the Holy Ghost' upon earth, which is listened for in Councils gathered, by representation, from areas varying in extent and therefore in the completeness of the induction afforded by them. (*a*) *An Œcumenical Council* gives the best prospect of reaching a truthful attestation of what is everywhere, and under the most dissimilar conditions of society, language, &c., held by all Christians. And to those few Councils in early times, which have the best claim to that title, the Church of England constantly refers

as possessing the highest authority, next to Scripture, for her. (Cf. Hooker, viii. 2. 17: the law of the land, for its part, assenting in 1 Eliz. 1, cap. 36.)

(β) *A General Council* offers an induction of somewhat narrower extent; and therefore its decisions are less trustworthy,—until at least they have been thoroughly tested by comparison with the 'Scriptural' documents in the hands of the faithful, and have been sanctioned by universal acceptance. Thus the first and second Councils at Constantinople were, perhaps, essentially only 'General Councils' of the Eastern Church; but being ratified by universal acceptance, in the West as well as in the East, they are accounted 'Œcumenical.' (Burn, *Eccles. Law*, ii. 31.) While the Lateran, Trent, and Vatican Councils, were merely 'General Councils' of the Latin Church, which have *not* been raised to a higher power by universal subsequent reception. The Pan-Anglican Councils, held in England during the middle ages, may be regarded as 'General Councils' on a small scale; and the similar assembly held at Lambeth, in 1867, was a tentative 'General Council' of the English-speaking Churches, on a far larger scale.

(γ) *The Provincial Synod*, or Convocation, covers an area still smaller. And as long as the Church of England maintains a 'protestant' attitude, and appeals from the false theories of Rome to the true theory of a future settlement by an Œcumenical Council, so long the decisions of any Provincial Synod must be held by her as capable of review. It is on the two Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York that, in practice, the State's hand lies most heavily. By 25 Hen. VIII. cap. 19, each Archbishop's inherent power of summoning his Provincial Council around him is placed under inhibition, except at certain accustomed times,—such as, at the opening of a session of Parliament: when the inhibition is regularly taken off by the Crown. But a licence to proceed to business, and to draw up and 'put in ure' any Provincial Canons, is still necessary. On the other hand,—owing to this same close connexion of the ecclesiastical and temporal powers in England, and to the free maxims of our polity which forbade any clergyman to be taxed in Convocation without having an opportunity of remonstrance and of presenting his *gravamina* at the same time,—the English Presbyterate has acquired the singular privilege of, not merely attending at Provincial Synods, but of putting their veto, if they see fit, on the action of the Upper House of Bishops, who are the sole *normal* members of a 'Provincial Council.' It is the action of the two Provincial Synods in England which —with the assent and concurrence of the State,—has provided us with the Disciplinary Canons of 1604, still in force for the clergy; with the Ritual Canons of 1662, commonly called the 'Book of Common Prayer;' and with the Doctrinal Canons of 1571, commonly called 'the Thirty-nine Articles.' [Consult,—Lyndwood's *Provinciale;* Johnson's *English Canons;* Wilkins' *Concilia;* Haddan and Stubbs, *Documents*, &c.; Cardwell's *Synodalia;*

Gibson's *Synodus Anglicana* (an account of Convocation, drawn from the records of eighty-eight such synods, 1356–1689); Lathbury, *History of Convocation;* Joyce, *Sacred Synods;* Warren's *Synodalia;* and the *Chronicle of Convocation.*]

(δ) *The Diocesan Synod* is, of course, a Council of still narrower area and still smaller authority. But it is important to observe that on this lower form of Ecclesiastical Synod the State appears to have laid no inhibition whatever; for 'the act of submission, &c. do not apply to diocesan synods.' (Opinion by Roundell Palmer and A. J. Stephens, Sept. 18, 1868.) Moreover, the *Reform. Legum* (p. 109) expressly contemplates and orders such synods to take place every year: as they did in the Middle Ages, (Lyndwood, *Suppl.*, p. 140: *Corp. Juris Can.* t. i. p. 79, folio edition: Lancelot, *Instit.* lib. i. tit. 3: Gibson, *Codex*, i. 188.) In modern times, the Bishops' visitations have superseded the proper 'diocesan synods.' But there are already many happy signs of a return to a better and more canonical method of procedure. [For a full account of the modern continental method of holding a diocesan synod; see the *Pontificale Rom.*, part iii. p. 75: ed. Mechlin, 1855.]

(ε) *The Ruridecanal Synod* is the smallest ecclesiastical council known to the Church of England. It is expressly mentioned in early times: e.g. in 1279, Archbishop Peckham held a Convocation at Reading, in which he ordered certain canons to be published at the principal ruridecanal chapters, throughout his province,—'exclusis tamen laicis;' which seems to prove that lay-consultees were usually present. (Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. 36.)—An attempt to set up councils of smaller area than this, would not only be uncanonical, but would probably become a fruitful source of feuds and parochial strife. The 'parochial council' is essentially a Presbyterian invention; and, with so many other well-seeming innovations, was tried during the Commonwealth, with disastrous results. (See Gauden's *Tears of the Church of England*, 1659: 'The speedy confutation of this incongruous polity and stratagem, which—to please the people—sought to besiege myself and all ministers, both in city and country, with four or five more lay-elders, made up of farmers, shopkeepers, clothiers, and handicraftsmen,—to be our assessors and assistants, as censors and supervisors of all the parish and of ourselves too,—this hath wrought an abhorrence and disdain in most people of all ruling-lay-elders.')

III. The Executive Power, in the Church of England, is lodged in the hands of her commissioned officers; among whom the Bishop,—not standing alone, but supported by his clergy,—bears by far the most important responsibility. The Bishop is the *persona* (so to speak) of the diocese; and *the diocese* (anciently called *παροικία*) *is the true unit in ecclesiastical arithmetic.* This is symbolized by his pastoral staff, the emblem of spiritual, loving,

persuasive power, as distinguished from the sword and mace of the temporal magnates. By him, in conjunction with his Presbyters, the lower Orders are commissioned: by him, in conjunction with his Comprovincial Bishops, the Archbishop is consecrated. Below him are the PRESBYTERS,—whose work is subject to his visitation and correction: and the DEACONS,—whose commission empowers them to serve under the Presbyters' guidance. The READER (or Lay-deacon) is a still lower order, lately revived.—The Archdeacon is simply the Bishop's coadjutor; the 'oculus episcopi,' (Lyndwood, *Provinc.* lib. i. tit. 10:) 'lynx ad insidias, Argus ad animi scelus omnimodum,' (Walter Mapes, † 1210: *Poems*, p. 9:)—armed with very large powers of visitation and inspection, within his own limited area, that he may report thereupon to the Bishop: but not armed with powers of Confirmation or Ordination, lest the unity of the diocese (wedded in olden time to the Bishop, by the episcopal ring) should be imperilled. The Dean and Chapter are merely the College of Presbyters, attached to the Bishop's own church, where his *cathedra* (or episcopal seat) is placed. They originally dined at a common table, and lived methodically under a common rule ('canonici'); being always at hand, both to conduct with the greatest possible efficiency the services of the mother church of the diocese, to go forth on missions of usefulness at the Bishop's bidding, and to form a standing cabinet (or 'diocesan-council') who might support the Bishop with advice and assistance at all times. Of this body of collegiate clergy, the Dean is the senior; and is to the Bishop very much what the captain of the flagship is to the admiral in command of a fleet. No part, however, of the whole organization of the Church has departed so widely, and so dangerously, from its ideal as the cathedral department. And if its meaning and use should become still further obscured, there is imminent danger of this essential member of the Church's diocesan system being impatiently, and most unwisely, destroyed. — The lower functionaries of the church (church-wardens, singers, sacristans, school-teachers, district-visitors, &c., &c.) are too numerous to mention here.

IV. THE JUDICIAL POWER,—for correction of offences, maintenance of discipline, &c.,—is lodged also by the Church of England mainly in the hands of her BISHOPS. They are the 'Ordinary' judges, in cases of scandal or dispute. And their courts are usually held in some part of the Cathedral or Close, set apart for that purpose. The Bishop's representative is the 'Chancellor of the Diocese;' who acts as his permanent deputy, skilled in Church-law; just as the Judges in the civil courts are the permanent skilled deputies of the Crown. Below this important court were formerly several inferior courts, in which the 'ordinary' judge was the Archdeacon, or the Dean, &c. Above it is the higher court of appeal, viz. the Provincial Court of the ARCHBISHOP. In this,

the sentence of the Bishop's Chancellor is subject to review, and to confirmation or reversal. And *beyond this, so far as the Church is concerned, no ecclesiastical litigation can be carried.* If therefore any person, at this point, feel confident that justice has not been done to him, he is at liberty to take up the common right of every English subject, and to appeal to his SOVEREIGN for redress. And the Sovereign issues a standing commission to certain members of the Privy Council, to hear and report to him what seems the true state of the case. And on receiving their report, he proceeds (as the fountain-head of justice to all his subjects, and supreme civil ruler of all classes and professions alike) to give a decision, which is absolutely final, and which puts a stop to any farther litigation on that particular point. This Court is called the *Judicial Committee of Privy Council.* It is essentially a civil tribunal; whereby the State exerts its rightful claims to see justice done to all English subjects, without allowing coercive appeal to any foreign power whatever. In other words, 'this Court now represents the Royal Supremacy, in its judicial character;' and is a modification (in 1832) of the previous 'Court of Delegates,'—an objectionable tribunal, whose members were not a permanent body, but nominated on each case as it arose, and whose decisions were (after all) liable to a fresh 'Commission of Review' from the Crown. This however had been the regular court of highest appeal, from 1534 till 1832,—only silenced for a time, but not destroyed, by the sharper and readier weapon of the 'High Commission,' an abuse of the Royal prerogative which was finally done away in 1640. (See Brodrick and Fremantle, *Judgments of Privy Council*, p. xxiv, &c.)

The Crown (as is natural) now requires, in this class of disputes, that one at the least of the ecclesiastical members of the Privy Council should attend. Still it is purely as a Privy-Councillor, 'expert' in such matters, that he is called upon to aid in reporting to the Crown whether justice has, or has not, been done. For the questions that come within the competence of this Court are simply and exclusively questions of law,—the bye-law (as it were) of certain denominations or professions. And just as Her Majesty fairly considers her legal advisers able to decide on questions of mercantile law,—without relegating the whole suit to a tribunal composed of merchants,—so she refers to her legal advisers these questions of ecclesiastical or 'canon' law, without thinking it likely to conduce to justice if she should establish a tribunal of ecclesiastics, to review and correct judgments already pronounced by ecclesiastics in the Courts below. These principles have been repeatedly laid down by the Court of Final Appeal itself. And it is surprising that so many people, both Churchmen and Dissenters, should have been unable to grasp (1) the essential difference between exercising *judicial* rights, and usurping *legislative* functions. The Court itself, in the Gorham case, expressly declared, 'The question which

we have to decide is, not whether the opinions of Mr. Gorham are theologically sound or unsound, . . but whether those opinions are repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England (by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics) requires to be held by its ministers.' (Brodrick, *Privy Council Judgments*, p. 89.) In other words, *it is the 'canon law' of the Church of England which is made the measure of the accused person's alleged delinquency;* and that canon law is not of course made by the Court, but simply applied to the case in question, as a pure matter of legal business. (2) It seems equally impossible for some people to comprehend, that *the great principles of law must needs apply to all things that have the nature of law,* whether 'canon law,' 'mercantile law,' or any other sort of law. And hence it is that they overlook the express and repeated declarations of the Privy Council itself. 'The question must be decided by the Articles and Liturgy; and we must apply to the construction of those books the same rules which have been long established, and which are by law applicable to all written instruments. We must endeavour to attain for ourselves the true meaning of the language employed, assisted only by the consideration of such external or historical facts, as we may find necessary to enable us to understand the subject-matter . . , and the meaning of the words employed.' (*Ibid.* p. 90.)

It is not therefore the *judicial* system of the Church that requires any alteration, beyond mere improvements in detail. It is her *legislative* organs that urgently require reformation. It is her Convocations that need adapting to the altered circumstances of the age; and that require the recovery of such *bonâ fide* representative weight as shall compel attention to the crying needs of the English Church; such as (*α*) a sub-division of dioceses, (*β*) a new and simpler code of 'disciplinary canons,' (*γ*) a thorough reform of the cathedrals, (*δ*) an authoritative extension of the Catechism, by an appendix, 'On the nature and functions of the Church.'—And if, in addition to this, an annual 'Diocesan Synod' and 'Conference' could be established in each diocese, and the lines could also be laid out for occasional assemblies, on a still larger scale, of representative bishops and clergy from America, the Colonies, and perhaps Germany,—it is not probable that the men of our race would seek elsewhere for an organization suited to their circumstances and in accordance with their character. The imagination of that numerous class of people, whose minds cannot grasp a confused mass of details and whose hearts cannot love what has neither feature nor expression, would be satisfied. And the frowning array of Roman superstition on the one hand, and of a withering infidelity on the other, would at last find an organized and powerful foe ready to do battle against them under the banner of the Cross, and capable—with or without the auxiliary forces of Dissent—of 'filling the earth with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.'

# APPENDIX N.

## *The Endowments of the English Church.*

The Endowments of the Church in this country are of three kinds: (1) Lands and buildings,—for the most part, gifts of very ancient date: (2) Money, invested for Church-purposes,—for the most part, gifts of quite modern times: (3) Tithes of the produce of the land,—now commuted into fixed payments in money, as a permanent rent-charge upon the land. A considerable proportion of this rent-charge is now (since the suppression of the monasteries) owned by laymen. The remainder forms the principal support of the clergy; and it produces a yearly revenue which, if equally distributed, would give each clergyman an average income of less than 200*l.*

*But what then is this 'Tithe'?*—In seeking for a true answer to this question we are first of all met by the unexpected discovery, that it does not originally rest, either on the *vis legislativa*, nor even on the *vis exemplaris*, of the Levitical Law. Its history must be traced down two separate and (for a time) divergent channels, each of which, however, springs originally from the fountain-head of a primeval Semitic custom. And for the sake of clearness, a name may be here at once mentioned, which will put this whole matter in its true light. MELCHIZEDEK, the Canaanite, 'priest of the most high God,' who received the *tithes* of Abraham's military spoil—quite as if it were a long established custom, among those races, so to do—may stand as the first recorded instance of that, which perhaps had as long an unknown history before his time, as it has had a known history since. From this point then, we may trace the custom of paying tithes along two channels, as follows: (A) *a sacred channel.*—From Abraham the Jews, his descendants, derived the custom; which was afterwards consecrated and regulated for them, in the Mosaic Law. And when, through the study of the Old Testament, that Law began to exercise a powerful influence in moulding the external features of the Christian Church, then 'tithe' began once more to take rank as a *religious duty*, directly sanctioned by the Most High. As such, it was preached—in all good faith—by the clergy. And thus, religion (from the fifth century onwards) reinforced, and imposed a distinctly ecclesiastical direction upon, that which previously had existed as a merely secular custom.

(B) *a secular channel.*—For 'tithe' has also a profane, as well as a sacred, history of its own: (1) From the Canaanites, as was natural, their colony at Carthage inherited the custom of devoting a *tenth* of the spoils taken in

war to their great deity, whom the classical writers call 'Hercules,' but whom perhaps we must call Baal or Moloch. This appears in their sending a tithe of their Sicilian spoils to the mother-temple at Tyre[1]. A similar custom existed among the Arabians[2]; and it has perhaps passed from them to the modern Mahometans. From this Carthaginian custom, on the one hand,—and from a similar 'tithing' custom brought by the Etruscans[3] from Asia Minor, on the other,—the Romans, no doubt, learnt their habit of tithing spoils of war to Hercules, (or, as he was called among the Sabines, Semo Sancus[4].) And then afterwards,—as was likely to happen,—not only spoils of war, but other windfalls or pieces of good luck were tithed to Hercules, Mercury, or Fortune[5]. And at last, rich men came to charge their *permanent estates* with a standing 'tithe,'—devoting it especially to providing sacrifices, temples, feasts, &c. to Hercules[6].

Meantime, a similar custom is found to have existed also among the Greeks. But in their case, Ephesus (instead of Carthage) formed the intermediate link of connection with the more distant and purely Semitic East. Hence Artemis (the Greek form of Astarte) was the first deity to receive tithes: then Phœbus, and other gods, were honoured in the same way: till at length, a custom arose of frequently charging lands, otherwise free, with a tenth of the produce in support of some neighbouring temple[7].

(2) And here we reach an important point of transition. The habit, which had thus become general, of withholding the hand (as it were) from the enjoyment of the tenth part—often, no doubt, a very roughly calculated tenth part[8]—of every man's possessions, was in early times taken notice of by legislators and statesmen. And ere long,—when waste lands came to be parcelled out among 'possessors' (or, to use an Australian term, 'squatters'), and when conquered lands were restored, under conditions of yearly tribute, to their former owners,—the *reserved charge* which it seemed most natural to put upon them, and most easy to collect, was that of a 'tithe' of the produce[9]. And so it came to pass that, long before Christianity had any influence upon the Roman Empire, this conception of tithes, as a reserve-fund set aside for other purposes than those of individual enjoyment, became thoroughly established in the Western world. And especially would this be the case in Gaul, Spain, and Britain,—which, as

---

[1] Justin, lib. xviii. (ap. Selden, *On Tithes*, chap. iii.)

[2] Pliny, *N. H.* xii. 14, (*ibid.*)

[3] Smith, *Dict. Ant.*, s. v. 'ager.'

[4] Gruter, *Inscrip.* (ap. Selden, loc. cit.)

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Cf. Cicero, Plautus, Plutarch, &c. (ap. Selden, l. c.)

[7] Cf. Xenophon, *Anab.* v. 3. 11, (ap. *Dict. Antiq.*, s. v. '*decumæ*.')

[8] Seld. x. 1.

[9] Cf. Thuc. vi. 54, and Appian i. 7, (*ibid.* 'decumæ' and 'agrariæ leges.') The whole subject may be illustrated from modern Indian customs. (Cf. Maine, *Village Communities*, especially Lecture VI.)

conquered provinces, could claim no *jus Italicum;* and whose soil therefore could never be held in full ownership by anybody[10]. Here this idea must have taken the profoundest root, and must have appeared to every provincial as almost the order of nature itself[11]. Meanwhile, language contributed—as is its wont—to deepen, and also to modify, the idea. A district of free 'allodial' Germany, seized by Rome and subjected to all the state-charges of the Empire, was called the *Decumates Agri.* In every Roman camp, the financial quarter, the paymaster's lodgings, the place (no doubt) for 'requisitions' and for many a cruel exaction of the 'sinews of war,' was called the *Porta Decumana*[12]. In every provincial town, the hated publican who farmed the annual imposts was called, in early times, a *Decumanus.* The notion, therefore, of 'Decumæ' (tithes), must have become as familiar as a household-word throughout the West; and no one, probably, conceived of such a thing as private-property without this charge attaching to it, by immemorial custom and by unquestionable right.

(3) Hence, when the Goths and Germans burst into the Roman Empire, and every petty chieftain became a sort of local 'emperor[13]' to the terrified provincials, he found himself everywhere confronted with the notion of a 'tithe' which had never belonged, and never ought to belong, to any individual owner[14]. And the clergy at the same time,—not indeed by laying claim to tithe as of right[15], but by urging frequently the duty of giving such firstfruits to the Lord, and by drawing their argumentative analogies from Leviticus,—no doubt contributed to bring about the important result; that 'Tithe' was, by ever widening custom, *assigned* for the maintenance of the Church[16]. Thus, so early as A.D. 586, in a Council held at Mâcon, all the Frankish landholders of those parts appear as paying tithes already by old custom.

(4) But at this point, a curious fact comes to light. It seems that the German or English landowner, until about A.D. 1200, held himself—although in ever decreasing measure, as time went on, and the Church became more powerfully organized—at liberty to *assign* his 'tithes' very much as he pleased[17]. He sometimes therefore gave part to the Church, and (having thus soothed his conscience) kept the rest for himself or his kindred[18]. He

---

[10] Niebuhr, (ap. *Dict. Antiq.*, p. 42): Seld. iv. 2.

[11] Cf Becker and Marquardt, *Handbuch der Röm. Alterth.*, part iii. 1, pp. 180, 263.

[12] Or 'Quæstoria,' *Dict. Antiq.*, p. 206.

[13] Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.* ii. 554: Holland, *Land Tenures*, p. 106.

[14] Waitz, ii. 564, 581: Selden, iv. 2; v. 2: Holland, p. 102.

[15] Selden, iv. 4.

[16] Waitz, ii. 570, 572.

[17] Selden, xi. 3: Waitz, ii. 576.

[18] Selden, vii. 1.

sometimes assigned it to the Church which he had built on his estate; sometimes to the Church where he himself habitually worshipped; sometimes he bestowed it on his own chaplain, sometimes on a monastery, or on several monasteries in turn,—just as pique or fancy moved him[19]. The consequence was, that this half-fixed, half-voluntary, tithe became a source of endless trouble and anxiety to the clergy; until they became strong enough, in the twelfth century, to organize the matter more firmly[20]. Besides which, a trust-fund of so very floating and arbitrary a character would always be in peril of a partial, or even complete, reversion into lay hands (infeudation),—where it would lose its sacred character, and become subject to ordinary feudal conditions[21].

Hence, no doubt, arose two phenomena which we meet with at every step during this whole period, down to about A.D. 1200; and which have often been singularly misunderstood. The *first* is, that Councils, Witenagemots, and other mixed assemblies, at this epoch, are found to be perpetually binding themselves afresh, and binding all those over whom they have influence, to a better fulfilment of their acknowledged duties in this matter. It is not that they are passing 'laws,' and (as it were) 'Acts of Parliament,' on the subject[22]. It is not 'the State,' which is here imposing *new taxes*. Else, why repeat the matter over and over again, through long centuries? But it is individual landholders, who have long recognised and long—in a confused and irregular way—fulfilled the duty of assigning their 'tithes' to sacred uses, now solemnly and publicly binding themselves to its regular fulfilment. It is an emperor, like Charlemagne, enjoining his lieges' attention to an acknowledged duty; 'unusquisque *suam decimam* donet[23]:' or it is a prince, like Ethelwolf, freeing from all regal exactions and service, the 'tithe' which he had already given, either to the Church or to his own theigns; . . 'ut decimam partem terrarum per regnum nostrum non solùm sanctis ecclesiis darem, verum etiam et ministris nostris [my theigns] in eodem constitutis, in perpetuam *libertatem* habere concessimus,—ita ut talis donatio . . permaneat ab omni regali servitio et omnium sæcularium absoluta servitute. . . Ista autem est libertas, quam Ethelwolfus Rex suo ministro Hunsige . . concessit, in loco qui dicitur Worthi' (Haddan and Stubbs, *Documents*, &c. iii. 638.) And that this 'freedom' was a concession of some value, appears from a similar grant only thirty-eight years before, from Kenulf King of Mercia to the Bishop of Worcester: 'liberam quoque istam terram conscripsi ab omnibus aliis . . servitutibus, præter tantùm his tribus causis (1) arcis, (2) pontis constructione, (3) et expeditione [the well-known

[19] Selden, xi. 1.
[20] *Ibid.* x. 2; p. 289.
[21] *Ibid.* xiii. 1. Adelung, *Glossarium*, ii. 28.
[22] Miall, *Title-Deeds*, passim.
[23] Ap. Selden, vii. 2.

'trinoda necessitas.'] . . Propter hanc *libertatem*, episcopus et ejus familia mihi tradiderunt xiv maneria.' (*Ibid.* p. 585.) Yet it is from such grants as these, that modern writers have argued that tithe is a 'tax,' imposed by the State; and not a 'rent-charge,' of primæval antiquity, consecrated frequently by private liberality to Church purposes. Although Selden himself, from whom all their facts are taken, explains the matter thus: 'this *freedom* of that time, you must (it seems) so interpret, that every man henceforth was to be valued in all subsidies and taxes according only to the nine parts of his lands and profits: and the profits of the tenth, being due to the Church, were both in his and their hands *discharged from all payment and taxes* whatsoever.' (Selden, *on Tithes*, viii. 4, p. 208, ed. 1618.)

The *second* phenomenon which meets us, at this early period, before A.D. 1200, is the constant and reiterated effort of the clergy to transfer tithe-giving from its true basis of a human and voluntary assignment—often accompanied by a collateral assignment of precisely similar 'tithes' to secular persons and purposes[24],—to what seemed a safer basis; viz. that of a divine obligation founded on the Old Testament. It was very natural that they should do so. And amid the universal ignorance of those times, both on historical and on theological questions, the argument was (no doubt) advanced and accepted in perfect good faith. And so—after a divergence of some two thousand years—the two streams of the history of Tithe, the heathen or secular and the Jewish or sacred, flow into the same channel once more. The strong hand of Innocent III, and the enthusiastic feelings engendered by the religious revival of the thirteenth century, combine towards the same result. And Tithe becomes, at last, a settled, sacred, and customary rent-charge upon property; and ecclesiastical tenures take their place among the other *beneficia* (or fee-ods) of the feodal system[25], of which they are to this day, to borrow a convenient word, a 'survival[26],' —the last remains of property held in conditional, not absolute, possession; and enjoyed as 'fee' for service done to the community.

(5) But this settlement did not remain very long unchallenged. The heated feelings of the thirteenth century soon gave rise to the mendicant orders. And the friars, loudly vaunting their new 'voluntary system,' severely shook the orderly parochial arrangements, and began to whisper the highly suggestive question, whether the established assignment of 'tithe' were, after all, a final one. (Selden, *Tithes*, viii. 4.) Ere long, the same question was repeated, above a whisper, by Wicliffe and the Lollards.

---

[24] Selden, *Review*, p. 478 (on chap. vii.)

[25] Guizot, *Civiliz.* iii. 25; Paul, *Hist. of Revenues*, p. 129.

[26] Tylor, *Prim. Culture*, i. 64.

(Lechler, *Wiclif*, p. 419.) And at length, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it was spoken quite openly; and the too stiffly organized parochial system gave way under the increasing pressure. A period of absolute confusion followed. And at the Restoration, in 1660, the old system was established once more; and was supported by the whole power of the State. Within the present century, the important and beneficial measure of 'tithe-commutation' was passed by Parliament, in 1836. And now at last, in 1871, it is proposed to throw recklessly away this precious heritage of a remote antiquity; to secularize what, 'when devotion grew firmer, and most lay-men of fair estate desired the country residence of some chaplains . . . for Christian instruction among them, their families, and adjoining tenants' . . 'passed from the patron *by his gift*, not otherwise than freehold by his deed and livery;' (Selden, *Tithe*, pp. 259, 373:) and to sink into the indistinguishable and already excessive mass of mere 'private property' and 'capital,' this last relic of the second and deeply interesting stage in the history of 'property[27],' when it had ceased to be held 'in common,' and was held 'in fee,' —with conditions of service attached.

[27] Paul, *Hist. of Revenues*, pp. 16, 22.

The following clearly arranged 'BALANCE-SHEET OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND' has lately been issued by the '*Yorkshire Union of Church Institutes.*'

## AVERAGE ANNUAL RECEIPTS.

| | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ENDOWMENTS. | | | | | | |
| Tithes and Rental of Lands | 1,949,204 | 14 | 0 | | | |
| Tithes, Rental of Lands, and Interest of Money Investments acquired for the maintenance of the Clergy since the Reformation | 2,251,051 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | 4,200,255 | 14 | 0 |
| STATE AID. | | | | | | |
| Parliamentary grant for the Education of the Poor | | | | 508,599 | 0 | 0 |
| VOLUNTARY SYSTEM. | | | | | | |
| Parochial Collections and Subscriptions | 3,182,400 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Contributions to London Church Societies | 400,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Contributions to miscellaneous Church Institutions other than Schools, and not included in Parochial Collections | 600,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Contributions in aid of Church Building and Restoration, not included in Parochial Collections | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| School payments of Parents | 762,898 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | 5,445,298 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | | | £10,154,152 | 14 | 0 |

## AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE.

| | £ | s. | d. | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MAINTENANCE OF THE CLERGY. | | | | | | |
| *I. Diocesan and Governmental Work.* | | | | | | |
| Net Salaries of 2 Archbishops, 26 Bishops, and 70 Archdeacons | 138,556 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| *II. Cathedral Work.* | | | | | | |
| Net Salaries of 30 Deans, 127 Canons, 120 Minor Canons, 600 Singers, together with many Lay Officers and Servants | 201,605 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| *III. Parochial Work.* | | | | | | |
| Net Salaries of 13,041 Rectors and Vicars, and 5,706 Curates | 3,146,051 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | 3,486,212 | 0 | 0 |
| Taxes, &c. on the Endowments of the Clergy, other than Income Tax, and those usually paid by Occupiers. [See 1 and 2 Vic. cap. 106, §§ 8 and 10] | | | | 714,043 | 0 | 0 |
| EDUCATION OF THE POOR. | | | | | | |
| Education of 2,044,406 Scholars in Church Schools, with Training of Teachers, &c. | | | | 3,051,573 | 0 | 0 |
| MISCELLANEOUS. | | | | | | |
| Church Institutions other than Schools. [See Low's 'Handbook of Charities'] | 1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Relief of the Poor, from Church Collections | 400,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Foreign Missions | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Current Church Expenses | 352,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Church Building and Restoration | 650,000 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| | | | | 2,902,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Balance | | | | 324 | 14 | 0 |
| Total | | | | £10,154,152 | 14 | 0 |

# INDEX.


Age of Prose, p. xi, 255.
America, unlike England, 119, 298.
Apostles' Creed, 309.
Arabic Canons of Nicæa, 157.
Art, function of, in the Church, 315, 330 *n.*, 326 *n.*
Articles, true use of, 309, 310 *n.*, 394.
Asceticism, mischief of, 186, 351.
Athanasian Creed, 320, 419 *n.*
Babylon, in 1 Peter v. 13, 170.
Baptismal Regeneration, 233, 235, 258 *n.*, 363, 365, 390.
Baptists, Ritual of, 213.
— Tenets of, 212, 242.
Bible, its true use, 262, 271, 273 *n.*, 293, 301, 324 *n.*
Bigotry and Faith, 331 *n.*
Browne, Robert, 68.
Buddhism, xiii, 303.
Bull of Pius V, 196.
Calvinism, 218, 230, 253, 261, 265, 374.
Cambridge, centre of Puritanism, 56.
Canon Law, 142, 321.
Cathedrals, Puritan hatred of, 54 *n.*
— true use of, 437.
Census of 1851 fallacious, 112.
Church and State, 44 *n.*
Church, visible, 10, 13, 236 *n.*, 365.
— denied by Dissent, 10 *n.*, 15 *n.*, 41, 92, 364.
— Scripture account of, 14, 365.
— English, advantages of, 239, 387, 398, 400, 417, 423 *n.*, 428, 433.
— — faults of, xviii, xix, 200, 223, 230, 257, 266, 268, 378, 402, 409, 418.
— — continuity of, 135.
— of the Commonwealth, a failure, 107, 118, 226.
Class-meetings, 388 *n.*
'Clementines,' the, 172.
Clergy, true function of, 259.
Comprehension, attempts at, 90.
Conference, Wesleyan, 375, 380, 393.
Confirmation, discipline of, 237, 239, 418.
Congregational Union, origin of, 40 *n.*
Congregationalism, its idea, 37, 42 *n.*
Convocation, 189, 435, 439.
Creeds, utility of, 307, 308 *n.*, 329.
Cromwell, against sects, 227.
Democracy and the Church, 108.
Despotic schemes of Charles II., 107, 118.
Dissensions allowable, 24, 34, 48 *n.*, 66.
Dissent not allowable, 8.
— collapse of, about A.D. 1700, 91.
— weariness of, 6, 48 *n.*
Divinity of Christ, 293 *n.*, 312.
Donatism, 220.
Dutch Anabaptists, 71, 211.
Duties, not Rights, xv, 23, 63, 64.
Eastern Church, 312 *n.*, 325 *n.*, 327 *n.*, 335.
Education, the Church's duty, 315 *n.*, 395.
Eighteenth century, 289, 343.
Ejectments, the (1662), 7, 67 *n.*
Endowments, of Church, 400 *n.*, 440, 446.
— of Dissent, 101, 377, 394.
England, not converted by Augustin, 140.
Episcopacy, history of, 27, 167, 406.
Erastian theory untenable, 89.
Errors, how best met, 7.
Europe, in sixteenth century, 51, 55.
Evangelical alliance, xiv, 411.
Exiles at Frankfort, 49, 53 *n.*
Fifth monarchy men, 88.
Final Court of Appeal, 412, 419, 438.
Five Independents executed, 73, 79.
'Forged Decretals,' the, 151.
France, chaos in, 429.
Free Churches want 'Freedom,' 99.
French prophets, 367, 371.
General Council, appeal to, 189, 201, 416, 435.
Gratry, Père, 161.
Grostête, Bishop, 181, 199.
Heresy, what it is, 142 *n.*, 321.
Independents, tenets of, 65, 72, 92, 125, 117 *n.*
— 'Establishment' proposed, 87, 89.
— worship of, 104.
Individuals, aid of, 311.
Infallibility, 192, 206.
Infant Baptism, 238.
'Inner Light,' the, 261, 263 *n.*
Irish Church, 112.
Jesuits, morals of, xvi, 63 *n.*, 163 *n.*
Lady Huntingdon's connexion, 376, 379.
Latin inaptitude for Theology, 325, 336.

Lay-agency, 42, 352.
Legend, growth of, 105, 175.
'Liberty,' meaning of, 95, 99.
Love of nature, modern, 290.
'Mar-prelate' Tracts, 76.
Martyrdom defined, 79.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 197.
Miracles, 306 *n.*
Monastic system, 85, 349, 356 *n.*
Montanism, 219, 253 *n.*, 255 *n.*, 276.
Moravians, 357, 376.
Mysticism, danger of, 367, 421.
New birth, the, 390.
'Nirwana,' 303 *n.*
Old-Catholics, xvi, 160, 387, 424.
Ordination, discipline of, 256 *n.*, 418, 423 *n.*
Oxford, 318 *n.*, 354, 403.
Papal forgeries, 145.
Parker, Archbishop, character of, 60.
Parliament, intolerant, 106.
Pastoral office, 269 *n.*, 279, 302 *n.*, 315 *n.*, 316 *n.*, 347, 389.
Penry, &c., why executed, 75, 79.
'Perfection' and 'assurance,' 361, 392.
Persecution, origin of, 31.
— mischief of, 32, 141 *n.*, 231.
Peter, St., not Bishop of Rome, 171.
'Pilgrim Fathers,' 80, 81.
Presbyterians, origin of, 44, 46 *n.*, 49.
— tenets of, 50, 121.
Primacy of St. James, 165.
— of Rome, 177.
Privilege, true idea of, 341.
Protestantism of Church of England, 188, 415, 424.
Puritans, tenets of, xiii, 46, 54, 63, 86 *n.*, 216.
Quakers, tenets of, 252, 258, 280.
— worship of, 272, 278.
Rationalism, danger of, 302, 304 *n.*, 327 *n.*, 420.
Reforms, need of, 247.
'Regium donum' to Dissenters, 91 *n.*
Reign of Law, 403 *n.*
Religious equality, 113.
— hysteria, 369.
Ritual, utility of, 330 *n.*, 404, 430.
Romanism, origin of, 30, 142, 166, 177, 195 *n.*
— failure of, in England, 44 *n.*, 53, 136, 138 *n.*, 140.
— a sect in England, 99, 136, 138 *n.*, 187 *n.*, 198.
— mischief of, 137 *n.*, 141 *n.*, 142 *n.*, 148, 196 *n.*
Romanism, political precautions against, 84, 180, 182, 196, 197 *n.*, 208, 415.
Royal Supremacy, meaning of, 59 *n.*, 75, 95 *n.*, 411, 433.
Salters' Hall controversy, 226, 296.
Scholasticism, long survival of, 252.
Science and Religion, 194, 207, 316, 403.
Sectarianism, evils of, xv, 8, 22, 48 *n.*, 62, 72, 107 *n.*, 118 *n.*, 136, 186 *n.*, 195.
Sects, mutual hostility of, xii, 50, 67 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 70 *n.*, 78 *n.*, 82, 87 *n.*, 89 *n.*, 91 *n.*, 94, 104, 106, 118 *n.*, 212, 216 *n.*, 226, 236 *n.*, 251, 258, 259 *n.*, 267, 277 *n.*, 295, 296 *n.*, 300, 308 *n.*, 312 *n.*, 366 *n.*, 379, 381, 407, 420 *n.*
Silent worship, beauty of, 278 *n.*
Simon Magus, legend of, 170.
Soul, triple nature of, 313.
Spener's 'societies,' 347.
Spiritual forces of the Church, xvi, 32, 141 *n.*, 178, 239, 259, 275, 314.
Spirituality, false and true, 98, 104, 115, 195, 219, 248 *n.*, 259, 269, 275 *n.*, 283, 365, 367.
Theology, its permanent and variable factors, 329.
Tithes are not 'taxes,' 440, 445.
Toleration, a modern idea, 43, 69 *n.*, 77, 82, 255, 295, 300, 410.
Transubstantiation, 35, 139.
Ultramontanism explained, 46 *n.*, 187 *n.*
Union desired by all, 119, 187, 408, 426, 431.
Union-workhouses, grand scale of, 111 *n.*
Unitarian Prayer-Book, 130, 310.
— tenets, 300, 308 *n.*
United States, 298, 378.
Unity of God, 319, 323.
Variations in Dissent, 66 *n.*, 384 *n.*
Vatican Council, 162 *n.*, 200, 203.
Vestments, &c., nothing in themselves, 54 *n.*
Voluntary system, inapplicable in Education and Religion, 100 *n.*
— meaning of, 97, 109.
— evils of, 101 *n.*, 118, 413, 415.
Waste, in nature and grace, 4.
Wesleyans, a 'society,' 184, 346, 357 *n.*, 363, 378 *n.*, 384, 387.
Working classes and the Church, 19, 109, 110 *n.*
Worship, united, 430.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 000 086 021 3